

To the Civil War Centennial Commission: Mr. TUCK, of Virginia; Mr. COFFIN, of Maine; Mr. SMITH, of Kansas; and Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, to serve with himself.

To the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana; Mr. JONES, of Alabama; Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts; and Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

To the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission: Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York; and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio.

To the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission: Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York, and Mr. DEROUNIAN, of New York.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center: Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey; and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 2, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Donald A. Maginnis, Jr., of Louisiana, to be Comptroller of Customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, term of 4 years.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Dana Latham, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

William L. Mitchell, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Social Security of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Claude H. Broach	Wallace L. Hancock,
Evor S. Kerr, Jr.	Jr.
Walter S. Bakutis	Adrian F. Werner
Edgar V. Carlson	Woodrow W. Vennel
Loren E. Brunner	Gilbert F. Schumacher
Charles E. Columbus	
William L. Sutter	Charles Tighe
Gilbert R. Evans	Richard Baxter
	Oscar D. Weed

The following-named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Roland H. Estey, Jr.	James C. Waters
Arthur L. Roberts	Stanley L. Smith
Louis L. Lague	Walter Curwen, Jr.
Freeman H. Harmon	David M. Alger

Arnold E. Carlson	Gene R. Gislason
Allen H. Graham	Lemuel C. Sansbury
Thomas M. MacWhinney	
Stanley H. Rice	Roderick L. Harris
Opie L. Dawson	Harold T. Hendrickson
Robert J. Clark	Clinton E. McAuliffe
David W. Woods	

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard H. Britt	Frank Barnett
Kenneth H. Langenbeck	Marion G. Shrode, Jr.
Robert D. Johnson	George F. Thometz, Jr.
Robert F. Henderson	Arthur A. Fontaine
Paul R. Peak, Jr.	Frederick W. Hermes, Jr.
Virgil N. Woolfolk, Jr.	James T. Maher
Elmer M. Lipsey	Gordon F. Hempton
James A. Hodgman	George A. Warren
Robert C. Phillips	William H. Boswell
Albert J. McCullough	Vance K. Randle, Jr.
Wesley M. Thorsson	Ricardo A. Ratti
Peter S. Branson	George W. Wagner
Harrison B. Smith	John J. Fehrenbacher
John M. Dorsey	Raymond G. Parks, Jr.
Paul A. Lutz	James H. Durfee
Robert C. Boardman	Richard P. Arlander
Parker O. Chapman	Clarence S. Hall, Jr.
William H. Brinkmeyer	Leonard J. Knight, Jr.
George H. Weller	Enoch A. Poulter
Benjamin J. Kowalski	Jack S. Thuma
David A. Webb	James N. Jensen
Richard W. Goode	Joseph N. Gonyeau
James L. Harrison	Walter C. Schafran
William E. Murphy	William G. Roden
John D. McCann	Sidney F. Hansen
Sumner R. Dolber	Joseph M. Weber
Garth D. Clizbe	Fred T. Merritt
Julian E. Johansen	James E. Nesmith
Lilbourn A. Pharris, Jr.	Robert R. Pope
Harold L. Davison	Albert E. Flanagan
John M. Austin	Earl S. Childers
Theodore C. Rapalus	Thomas J. Hynes
Clarence R. Easter	William G. Fenlon
Harley E. Dilcher	Louis Hopper, Jr.
	John H. Tooley
	Gerard R. Decker

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Andrew F. Nixon	John G. Beebe-Center
Forrest E. Stewart	Gilbert L. Kraine
William A. Maki	Hubert E. Russell
Donald L. Savary, Jr.	Charles J. Glass
William K. Vogeler	Richard M. Morse
Donald H. Reaume	James P. Marsh
Harold R. Brock	Benedict L. Stabile
Glenn D. Jones	William R. Nodell
George H. Drinkwater	Robert E. Fletcher
Oscar J. Jahnsen, Jr.	Horace G. Holmgren
William J. Spinella	Claude R. Thompson
Richard G. Donaldson	Raymond H. Wood
William D. Derr	John C. Guthrie, Jr.
Arthur G. Morrison	Robert C. Stanciliff
John T. Rouse	Ferney M. McKibben
David E. Metz	Arnold R. Reynolds
Bruce N. Donnelly	Sidney B. Vaughn, Jr.
James R. Meeker	Eugene A. Delaney
Frederick J. Lessing	Roderick M. White
Sherman G. Sawyer	James L. Fleishell
Joseph A. Macri	Robert K. Adams
Richard J. MacGarva	Clifford F. DeWolf
Edgar S. Castle	Royal E. Grover, Jr.
William T. Sode	William G. Dick
Donald J. Riley	Thomas A. Clingan, Jr.
Thomas F. McKenna, Jr.	Harry J. Hayes
Richard D. Hodges	Allan B. Rose
Preston M. Bannister, Jr.	Charles F. Juechter, Jr.
John C. Dowling	Jack L. Smith
Walter B. Alvey	Rudy Roberts
William L. Webster	Harry A. Feigleson, Jr.
John M. O'Connell, Jr.	John C. Fuechsel
Norman C. Venzke	Warren W. Waggett

Leo V. Donohoe	Nelson G. Emory
Adrian L. Lonsdale	Calvin F. Bonawitz
Alva L. Carbonette	Louis Moats
Robert A. Seufert	Ralph W. Sibley, Jr.
Berry L. Meaux	David Lerner, Jr.
Harold W. Parker	Richard K. Simonds
John P. Muhlbauer	Joseph P. Dawley
Clarence C. Hobdy, Jr.	Leigh A. Wentworth
Lawrence J. Otto	John E. Gates
Daniel S. Bishop	Martin J. Ruebens
Robert G. Lyle	Robert F. Mercier
Jack E. Buttermore	Gordon D. Hall
Normand E. Fernald	Robert L. Sullins
Beverly V. Billingslea	James C. Knight
Leon Y. Wald	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Benjamin R. Sheaffer, Jr.	Ronald N. Gaspard
Kearney L. Yancey, Jr.	Edward R. Baumgartner
Charles A. Millradt	Robert J. Ross

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named persons for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Ross A. Gilmore, effective December 1, 1958	Ira R. Rubottom
Gilbert C. Mast	Maurice E. Wennermark
Fred A. Riddell	Fred Natella

TO BE COMMANDER

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

William R. Kachel	Merlyn E. Natto
Hal P. Demuth	Alfred C. Holmes
Pentti A. Stark	

TO BE LIEUTENANT

James P. Randall
Kelly E. Taggart

TO BE ENSIGN

Robert M. Davidson	Paul D. Montjoy, Jr.
Charles G. Elliott	Ray E. Moses
Frederick C. E. Gebhardt	Pat T. Redden
Arthur H. Goldberg	Gerald C. Saladin
Peter A. Martus	Sigur C. Stavran
Donald C. McIntosh	Donald R. Tibbit
	Karl R. Tipple

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 8: 26: *Jesus said unto them, why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?*

O Thou God of all grace, we are again coming unto Thee in the fellowship of prayer, seeking together those needed blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

We humbly and earnestly beseech Thee to emancipate us from those fears which so frequently enslave us with a sense of futility and frustration.

Bless us with a larger measure of faith and enable us to lay hold upon Thy glorious promise that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 27, 1959, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 64

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable George H. Christopher, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-775, providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the Vice President had appointed Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HARTKE as members on the part of the Senate of the Committee on Arrangements.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 715a, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; and Mr. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NAVAJO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 10, Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration the following members on the part of the House: Mr. UDALL, of Arizona; Mr. ANDERSON, of Montana; and Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 513, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER, of Mississippi; and Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College the following members on the part of the House: Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas; and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. O'BRIEN, of New York; and Mr. DE-ROUNIAN, of New York.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York; and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSTRUCTION OF MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4, Public Law 106, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana; Mr. JONES, of Alabama; Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts; and Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Monument Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. JONES, of Alabama; Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon; Mr. WESTLAND, of Washington; and Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE of Texas; Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan; Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York; and Mr. LAIRD, of Wisconsin.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; Mr. BREWSTER, of Maryland; Mr. ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and Mr. OSTER- TAG, of New York.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Colorado; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado; and Mr. FORD, of Michigan.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 46 U.S.C. 1126c, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ANFUSO, of New York; and Mr. FINO, of New York.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following members on the part of the House: Mr. BOWLES, of Connecticut; and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HAYS, of Ohio; and Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland; and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-262, the Chair appoints as members of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. CHELF, of Kentucky; Mr. DENTON, of Indiana; Mr. MACK, of Illinois; Mr. ALLEN, of Illinois; Mr. BRAY, of Indiana; and Mr. SILER, of Kentucky.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-305, the Chair appoints as members of the Civil War Centennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. TUCK, of Virginia; Mr. COFFIN, of Maine; Mr. SMITH, of Kansas; and Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 85-470, the Chair appoints as members of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mrs. PROST, of Idaho; Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. COLLIER, of Illinois.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE HUDSON-CHAMPLAIN CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-614, the Chair appoints as members of the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. CELLER, of New York; Mr. HOLTZMAN, of New York; Mr. TAYLOR, of New York; and Mr. LINDSAY, of New York.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS TO BE HELD ON FEBRUARY 12, 1959

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-775, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Arrangements for the joint session of the Congress to be held on Thursday,

February 12, 1959, commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MACK, of Illinois; Mr. DENTON, of Indiana; Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa; and Mr. BRAY, of Indiana.

HOUSE MEMBERS EX OFFICIO OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 85-874, the Chair appoints as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center the following members on the part of the House: Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas; Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey; and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania.

NINTH SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED ON UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 60)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Ninth Semiannual Report on Activities Carried on Under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as Amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 28, 1959.

FOURTEENTH SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 451, 85TH CONG.)

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

(For President's message see p. 1256 of Senate proceedings of January 28, 1959.)

LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 10)

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered printed.

(For President's message see pp. 1297-1298 of Senate proceedings of January 28, 1959.)

AGRICULTURE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

There are produced, in the United States, some 250 farm commodities. The law has required that prices of 12 of these be supported at prescribed minimum levels. It is this requirement, together with the level of required support, that has created our farm surplus problems. Farmers who produce cattle, hogs, poultry, fruits, vegetables, and various other products, the prices of which are not supported—as well as those who produce crops the prices of which are supported at discretionary levels—have generally experienced growing markets rather than a buildup of stocks in warehouses.

Three of the 12 mandatory products (wheat, corn, and cotton) account for about 85 percent of the Federal inventory of price-supported commodities though they produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

The price-support and production-control program has not worked.

1. Most of the dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers.

Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from production of about half of those farms—the largest ones.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production of about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

For other supported crops, a similarly disproportionate share of the expenditure goes to the large producers.

For wheat, cotton, and rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures per farm for the present fiscal year are approximately as follows: Wheat, \$7,000 per farm; cotton, \$10,000 per farm; rice, \$10,000 per farm.

Though some presently unknown share of these expenditures will eventually be recovered through surplus disposal, the final cost of the operation will undoubtedly be impressively large.

Clearly, the existing price support program channels most of the dollars to those who store the surpluses and to relatively few producers of a few crops. It does little to help the farmers in greatest difficulty. For small operators the rural development program approach, which helps develop additional sources of income, has clearly demonstrated that it is a far better alternative.

2. The control program doesn't control. Mandatory supports are at a level which so stimulates new technology and the flow of capital into production as to offset, in large part, the control effort.

Despite acreage allotments and marketing quotas, despite a large soil bank program and despite massive surplus disposal, Government investment in farm commodities will soon be at a new record high. On July 1, 1959, total Government investment in farm commodities will total \$9.1 billion. Investment in commodities for which price support is mandatory will total \$7.6 billion, of which \$7.5 billion will consist of those crops designated by law as basic commodities: wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. And these stocks are increasing rather than diminishing.

We already hold such huge stocks of wheat that if not one bushel of the oncoming crop were harvested we would still have more than enough for domestic use, export sales, foreign donation, and needed carryover for an entire year.

3. The program is excessively expensive.

When the 1958 crops have come into Government ownership, the cost, in terms of storage, interest and other charges, of managing our inventory of supported crops, for which commercial markets do not exist at the support levels, will be running at a staggering rate, in excess of a billion dollars a year. Unless fundamental changes are made, this annual cost will rise.

This sum is approximately equal to the record amount being spent in fiscal 1960 by the Federal Government on all water resource projects in the United States including power, flood control, reclamation, and improvement of rivers and harbors.

During the present fiscal year, the net budgetary outlay for programs for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income will be \$5.4 billion; \$4.3 billion of this is for commodities for which price supports are mandatory. While some unpredictable part of this outlay will be recovered in later years through sales for dollars, sales for foreign currency and through barter, the cost will be great, especially when compared with the net income of all farm operators in the United States, which in 1958 was \$13 billion. Budgetary expenditures primarily for the support of farm prices and farm income are now equal to about 40 percent of net farm income.

Not a bushel of wheat nor a pound of cotton presently is exported without direct cost to the Federal Treasury.

Heavy costs might be justifiable if they were temporary, if they were solving the problems of our farmers, and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But unfortunately this is not true.

These difficulties are not to be attributed to any failure on the part of our farm people who have done an outstanding job of producing efficiently. They have in fact responded to the price incentive as farm people—and other people—traditionally have.

Our farm families deserve programs that build markets. Instead they have programs that lose markets. This is because the overall standards for the programs that they have are outdated relationships that existed nearly half a century ago. This was before 60 percent of our present population was born.

At that time it took 106 man-hours to grow and harvest 100 bushels of wheat. In recent years it has taken not 106 but 22. Since then the yield of wheat has doubled. Similar dramatic changes have occurred for other crops.

It is small wonder that a program developed many years ago to meet the problems of depression and war is ill-adapted to a time of prosperity, peace, and revolutionary changes in production.

The need to reduce the incentives for excess production has been explicit in the three special messages on agriculture which I have previously sent to the Congress. The point has repeatedly been made by the Secretary of Agriculture in his testimony and in his statements to the Congress. The Congress has moved in the right direction but by an insufficient amount. There has been a general tendency to underestimate the pace at which farm technology has been moving forward. Hence there has been a tendency to underestimate the production-inducing effect of the prescribed minimum price support levels.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that prices for those commodities subject to mandatory supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. The appropriate percentage of the average market price should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at a level not less than 75 and not more than 90 percent of such average in accordance with the general guidelines set forth in the law. Growers of corn, our most valuable crop, have already chosen, by referendum vote, program changes which include supports based on such an average of market prices.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to advise the gentleman from Michigan, if he persists in the point of order, I intend to make a motion that the House adjourn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am making the point of order, I will say to the majority leader, is so that all the Members might finish their discussions and then we could have the message read. Of course, in deference to the majority leader, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read the remainder of the message, as follows:

If, despite the onrush of science in agriculture, resulting in dramatic increases in yields per acre, the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to existing standards, the Secretary should be given discretion to establish the level in accordance with the guidelines now fixed by law for all commodities except those for which supports presently are mandatory.

Either of these changes would be constructive. The effect of either would be to reconcile the farm program with the facts of modern agriculture, to reduce

the incentive for unrealistic production, to move in the direction of easing production controls, to permit the growth of commercial markets and to cut the cost of Federal programs.

As we move to realistic farm programs, we must continue our vigorous efforts further to expand markets and find additional outlets for our farm products, both at home and abroad. In these efforts, there is an immediate and direct bearing on the cause of world peace. Food can be a powerful instrument for all the free world in building a durable peace. We and other surplus-producing nations must do our very best to make the fullest constructive use of our abundance of agricultural products to this end. These past 4 years our special export programs have provided friendly food-deficit nations with \$4 billion worth of farm products that we have in abundance. I am setting steps in motion to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of utilizing the various agricultural surpluses of each in the interest of reinforcing peace and the well-being of friendly peoples throughout the world—in short, using food for peace.

Certain details regarding the needed changes in law, particularly with reference to wheat, are appended to this message in the form of a memorandum to me from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Difficulties of the present program should not drive us to programs which would involve us in even greater trouble. I refer to direct payment programs, which could soon make virtually all farm people dependent, for a large share of their income, upon annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury. I refer also to various multiple price programs, which would tax the American consumer so as to permit sale for feed and export at lower prices.

To assist the Congress in discharging its responsibility, the administration stands ready, as always, to provide the appropriate committees with studies, factual data and judgments. Continuation of the price support and production control programs in their present form would be intolerable.

I urge the Congress to deal promptly with this problem.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 29, 1959.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STAND- ING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a resolution (H. Res. 144) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected mem-

bers of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on District of Columbia: Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Wint Smith, Kansas; Steven B. Derounian, New York; Jessica McC. Weis, New York.

Committee on Government Operations: Robert R. Barry, New York.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Katharine St. George, New York.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: R. Walter Riehlman, New York.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Seymour Halpern, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRESIDENT WILLIAM McKINLEY: A TRIBUTE TO A SON OF OHIO

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of William McKinley, and I wish to pay tribute to this illustrious citizen of Ohio on behalf of my colleagues from the State of Ohio.

In the Congressional Directory, published 82 years ago, appears McKinley's modest biography as one of the newly elected Members of the 45th Congress.

Up to that time young McKinley had made a gallant record as a soldier. He was then to make an even greater record as a statesman.

Schooled in Ohio, and at Allegheny College, Pennsylvania, McKinley had taught in a rural school before he enlisted as a private in the Union Army.

In 1867 young McKinley opened a law office at Canton, where he maintained his permanent residence, and 2 years later was elected prosecuting attorney.

He married the daughter of a local banker, and two daughters were born to them. Both girls passed away and thereafter Mrs. McKinley became an invalid. The devotion of the rugged McKinley to his frail wife has remained a touching example of love and fidelity through the years.

In front of the State House in Columbus, Ohio, there appears a monument to William McKinley. It was placed in that position for this reason: While Governor of the State of Ohio he lived at a hotel immediately across the street from the State House. Each morning as he left the hotel he would stop at the very spot where the monument is placed and he would turn and wave to his invalid wife who sat in the hotel window.

He also had another habit of wearing a red carnation, that the Members are wearing today. It was his favorite flower, and in tribute to President McKinley the State adopted the red carnation as the official flower of the State of Ohio.

William McKinley was first elected to Congress at the age of 34. In his first term, he allied himself with the Silver Republicans from the Western States. At the end of the year Speaker S. J. Randall placed him on the Committee on Ways and Means. In 1889 he became chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in charge of the new tariff bill. McKinley was, throughout the ensuing debate, the moderator and harmonizer.

Although he had served four terms, McKinley was defeated for Congress in

1890, but he was elected Governor of Ohio in the strenuous campaign of the next year. In 1893 he was reelected Governor.

During his years as Governor, McKinley worked successfully to improve Ohio's canals, roads, and public institutions. One of his greatest achievements was the establishment of a State board of arbitration to settle disputes between employers and employees. He was a national figure by the time he left the governorship.

In 1897 William McKinley became the 25th President of the United States. His first inaugural address, delivered March 4, 1897, reads as though it had been written to meet present problems. He said, and I quote:

The severest economy must be observed in public expenditures, and extravagance stopped wherever it is found, and prevented wherever in the future it may be developed. * * * The Government should not be permitted to run behind or increase its debts in times like the present. * * * The best way for a government to maintain its credit is to pay as it goes.

During his years in the White House, he did a great service to our Nation. New and difficult problems were wisely solved and the large issues were met in a spirit of finest patriotism and public service. Conciliatory and gracious, respectful of his opponent's point of view, President McKinley never would consent to belittle those who did not see eye to eye with him. He would have recoiled at the thought of a smear campaign. He cherished no ambition to be the master of anyone, he refused to indulge in personalities. Selfish groups did not intimidate him.

President McKinley's friends considered his amiability his greatest fault. As Jefferson said of Washington, "He erred with integrity." He was a man of deep and sincere religious faith. His career demonstrated that success with one's fellow man is not incompatible with an earnest Christian life.

It has been said that President McKinley's last speech was his best. He had grown steadily as a public speaker, just as he had grown in every other way, until he had become one of the great orators of his time.

It was not expected that his address at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo on September 5, 1901, would be especially important. Yet many thousands waited in front of the temporary stand on the exposition grounds to hear him deliver it. They were rewarded with a remarkable address. It was felt that he was laying before the whole world his purposes for the remainder of his administration. No one had the slightest idea that he would never again speak in public. But the following day—September 6, 1901—President McKinley was shot by an anarchist and died 8 days later.

I would like to quote briefly from President McKinley's last speech nearly 60 years ago:

God and man have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstanding,

and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes. * * *

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we Members of the 86th Congress would do well to look to William McKinley's personal and political ideals as we mark this anniversary of his birth.

He left this message for all of us as he passed from this life:

It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done.

The SPEAKER. Without objection all Members who desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life, times, and character of Ex-President William McKinley.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 116th anniversary of the birth of William McKinley, who became President of the United States in 1897.

President McKinley was born in the little town of Niles, located in eastern Ohio. His parents were sturdy, middle-class working folks, who descended from Scotch, Irish, and English generations. He attended the Ohio public schools, Poland Academy, and Allegheny College, in Pennsylvania.

During the Civil War William McKinley enlisted on June 23, 1861, and served 4 years in the Union Army, Ohio Volunteers. He enlisted as a private and was mustered out as a brevet major.

After the war he practiced law at Canton, Ohio, served as prosecuting attorney and was first elected to Congress in 1876, serving in the House of Representatives from 1877 to 1882. Then he was defeated, but was elected again in 1886 and served until 1890. During his years in the House he became recognized as a foremost champion of the protective tariff, and gained renown as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was elected Governor of Ohio in 1891, was inaugurated on January 11, 1892; reelected in 1893 and served until January 13, 1896.

In 1895 a systematic canvass in McKinley's behalf for the presidential nomination was instituted by his supporters and was continued until the Republican Convention in 1896. He was nominated, and, after an extremely bitter campaign on the issue of the gold standard versus free coinage of silver, was elected as champion of the gold standard.

President McKinley's first term is memorable chiefly for the occurrence of the Spanish-American War. That his policy during 1896-1900 was acceptable was shown by his unanimous renomination and by his reelection in 1900 by an electoral majority of 137. His second term began most auspiciously but ended tragically.

On September 5, 1901, he visited the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, that day having been set apart in his honor and called the President's Day.

On the afternoon of the following day, while holding a public reception in the Temple of Music, he was shot twice by an anarchist. The wounded President was removed to the residence of the president of the exposition, and died there September 14. He was buried in Canton, Ohio.

It has been told that while a Member of this Congress, friends from McKinley's district advised him that enemies in his district were circulating malicious gossip about him and that he should make a public reply. McKinley answered:

I have no enemies. My constituents have a right to express what they claim to be their opinions. I need criticism and I love those who criticize me. They help me most.

Naturally kindly, a good conciliator, McKinley's strength was in defending principles. He was an earnest and loyal party man. He sought and accepted the advice of trusted associates.

President McKinley was a man of towering presence and wherever he appeared in public, his contemporaries were inspired by his very appearance. He was eloquent in speech.

He married Ida Saxton, cashier in a Canton bank, when he returned from military service. Mrs. McKinley has been called the first business woman to become the first lady. The marriage was one of devoted affection, with the greater need for devotion when, after the birth and early death of two daughters, Ida McKinley became an invalid. President McKinley's care and solicitation never wavered. Mrs. McKinley was at his side at state social affairs, accompanied him on official journeys, and was with him at Buffalo when he was assassinated.

As we honor the birth date of our 25th President, we do not commemorate just a date on the calendar, but rather we commemorate the spirit, the wisdom, and the courage of a man who had a high regard for what he believed to be honest and true, and, in his period, for the best interests of our country.

INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 78, to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1959, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee:

(1) the administration, management, and operations of the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(2) the mallability of articles and printed matter generally, including, among other things, the mailing of (A) obscene matter, (B) matter which reasonably may be expected to arouse or activate racial, religious, or class hatred or animosity, and (C) un-

solicited articles and matter with requests for payments or contributions;

(3) the application, operation, and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including matters relating to (A) compensation, (B) position classification, (C) examination, (D) appointment, (E) assignment of positions excepted from the competitive service to schedules A, B, and C under rule VI of the Civil Service Rules, (F) allocation of positions to, and distribution of positions in, grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, (G) actions taken pursuant to section 505(1) of such Act, as amended by Public Law 85-462, (H) promotions, (I) reduction in force, and (J) separation from the service by action other than reduction in force;

(4) the desirability and effect of contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of personal, administrative, and management services;

(5) the effect of the contracting practices of the Federal Government on the availability and utilization of personnel qualified for the performance of essential functions of the Federal Government;

(6) the organization, management, and operations of the United States Civil Service Commission, including the delegation of authority to the department and agency Boards of Civil Service Examiners and the audit and control thereof;

(7) operations under the Classification Act of 1949;

(8) actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigations and studies, conducted by the committee under authority of H. Res. 32, Eighty-third Congress, H. Res. 304, Eighty-fourth Congress, and H. Res. 139, Eighty-fifth Congress, with respect to the utilization and dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(9) dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of civilian positions, number of civilian positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate;

(10) (A) the organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce and (B) statistical and related activities other than those of the Bureau of the Census;

(11) insurance plans and programs of the Government for Government employees and related matters; and

(12) the operation and effect of training programs under the Government Employees Training Act.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 5, insert: "Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual investigatory resolution for the Civil Service Committee and similar to resolutions presented the other day for other committees. It is in line with the resolution granted that committee last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution had the unanimous support of all members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me that the requests of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have been modest in the past and are now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways; in Mexico, and in Central American countries, the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road; and, in the Dominion of Canada, the Saint Lawrence Seaway project.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the

signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, but no more than five members of such committee may attend any meeting outside of the continental United States except trips in connection with the investigation of the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road and matters relating to the Saint Lawrence Seaway project in the Dominion of Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, after the word "That" insert "effective from January 3, 1959".

Page 1, strike out the following language in lines 4 and 5: "its Territories, and possessions".

Page 1, line 9, change semicolon to period and strike the following language in lines 9, 10, 11, and 12: "in Mexico, and in Central American countries, the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road; and, in the Dominion of Canada, the St. Lawrence Seaway project".

Page 2, line 4, strike "its Territories, and possessions".

Page 2, line 15, change comma after the word "United States" to a period, and strike out the following language in lines 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21: "its Territories, and possessions, but no more than five members of such committee may attend any meeting outside of the continental United States except trips in connection with the investigation of the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road and matters relating to the Saint Lawrence Seaway project in the Dominion of Canada".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority join in support of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT FULL AND COMPLETE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 113 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1959, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and

measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of U.S. programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 1, change "4" to "3."

Page 2, after line 13, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution granting to the Committee on Foreign Affairs authority to investigate matters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority agrees with this resolution.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 105 and ask for its present consideration. May I ask the Clerk when he gets to the reading of the committee amendments to pause as I have a substitute for a committee amendment in one instance.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 7, 1959, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American merchant marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and

all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

For such purposes the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places (A) within the United States, its possessions, the Territory of Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone; (B) elsewhere within the North American Continent; and (C) elsewhere when in connection with any study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the chairman designate more than seven committee members and three staff members to proceed outside the United States on any one study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 10, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 12, following the word "thereof" insert the word "as."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, after "places" strike out "(A)."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, after "places", strike out down to and including the word "system" on line 23 and insert after the word "places" on line 17 the following

"within the United States, its possessions, the Territory of Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone."

The substitute to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 3, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority favors the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 130 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1959, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters within its jurisdiction:

(1) (a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction (including but not limited to the San Luis project in California, the Frypan-Arkansas and Juniper projects in Colorado, the Burns Creek project in Idaho, the Spokane Valley project in Washington, the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, the Mid-State project in Nebraska, the Norman project in Oklahoma, the Vale project in Oregon, and the Cheney project in Kansas), and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws covering the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; and (d) the saline water program.

(2) (a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, including those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the condition, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) minerals research, including coal research, needed to improve the position of the domestic minerals industries; (e) proposed long-range domestic minerals programs; and (f) the effects upon domestic mining industries of the world metals situation and the means available to the Government for alleviating the same.

(3) The status, progress, and administration of the national park system and its units and of other recreational developments on public lands or under the jurisdiction of or affecting the Department of the Interior.

(4) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior and of forest reserves created out of the public domain.

(5) (a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered and with which moneys available to carry out its purposes are being used; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the present status of Indian treaties and agreements; (d) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (e) the utilization of tribal land and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization; (f) problems of fractional heirships and the means of solving them; and (g) the adequacy and cost of attorney services for Indians and Indian tribes.

(6) The status, progress, and administration of the Territories and insular possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including particularly operations under the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended; the return of federally held lands in Hawaii and Puerto Rico to local control and ownership; an analysis and evaluation of the Puerto Rico Commonwealth Act of 1952; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of 1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and the Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended (with especial attention, in the case of the latter, to the tax structure and financial problems of the government of Guam); local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in an organic act for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; matters affecting American Samoa, and problems concerning the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation or study requires; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may require, by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Sec. 3. In addition, in order that the committee may be informed as to what other nations are doing in the field of water resources development and because such information will be of value to the Congress and to the committee in consideration of matters within the committee's jurisdiction and is pertinent to the duties of the committee under rule XI, clause 26, of the Rules of the House, a special subcommittee of not more than three members of the committee, accompanied by not more than two members of its staff, may visit and, if found appropriate, hold hearings at such places outside the United States as the chairman may designate during adjournment of the House and shall report its findings to the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 2, strike out "its Territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the first committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, insert:

"Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 18, strike out section 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 20) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1959, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 19, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000, including expenditures for the employment of a special counsel, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield for this purpose, and it is to ask him to explain to the House the procedure under which the subcommittee of which he is chairman has unanimously approved these several resolutions after full hearings and that the entire Committee on House Administration has also unanimously approved these several resolutions.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman is correct. I want to say this, that the subcommittee passed every one of these resolutions we have by unanimous vote, and also the full committee by unanimous vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK FOR NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 36) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1959, the Chairman of the House Delegation of the United States Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarians' Conference is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ a clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives at a rate of basic compensation not to exceed \$6,000 per annum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us something about this proposed new employee? This salary of \$6,000 is base; is it not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What would be the total salary?

Mr. FRIEDEL. About eleven thousand and some hundred dollars.

Mr. GROSS. What is the necessity for this clerk?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] to explain that, if I may.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to explain the matter to the gentleman. This organization consists of 200 members of the various parliaments of the 15 NATO countries who have been meeting for the past 4 years in Paris. This year they are meeting in Washington, and it is necessary to have someone to make the necessary numerous arrangements relative to a meeting place, translators, and so forth, to get this conference under way. The French have done this for 4 years and have spent a considerable amount of money on it. I might say that I have cleared this with the Speaker. We thought that it was fair that for this fifth conference—this will not be held necessarily once every 5 years here; it may not come here again for 10 years, but we felt that we ought to do our part in having this conference in the United States this fifth year.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, where is this gentleman going to be parked? What provision is going to be made for office space?

Mr. HAYS. I have asked the Speaker to try to find me a room for him.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought. How has this NATO parliamentary conference been able to operate in the past without this \$12,000-a-year employee?

Mr. HAYS. Because we have not had the meeting here in the past. I might say to the gentleman that I invited him to apply to be a delegate from his side to this conference and he would have learned something about it. But he did not want to do that. I hope the gentleman will reconsider.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa is not interested in two or three junkets a year to foreign countries.

That is all this organization amounts to. It is a junketing organization.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Am I privileged to offer an amendment to this resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has the floor. If he does not yield for that purpose, the gentleman may not offer the amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not yield for an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any limitation upon the employment of this flunkie for this junketing organization? There is none, is there?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; there is. Our committee studied this matter very thoroughly. It passed the subcommittee and the full committee by a unanimous vote. It was thoroughly gone into. We felt it was necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Under your resolution, what is the termination date for the services of this individual?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is only for this Congress.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the resolution says.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is for the 86th Congress; it is not to continue after that.

Mr. GROSS. Under the gentleman's resolution, he may be continued on indefinitely; is that not true?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No; it is just for the 86th Congress.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I may say to the gentleman that the way the resolution is written it would be at the discretion of the Chair. But I should like to point out also, since I have been chairman of this group, since its inception, there has not been a year that I have failed to return at least one-third or more of the money allocated for the expenses of the group. I hope the gentleman would trust my good judgment not to abuse this authority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I should hope the gentleman would turn back some money, because he and his fellow junketeers have been using MATS for transportation. You have been using offices of the armed services, of one kind or another, to haul your group around Europe, to take care of your baggage, and so forth. I should think you would turn back some money.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution, and I think we ought to have a vote on it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Nothing can be done unless the gentleman from Iowa withdraws his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. I will withdraw it temporarily.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this resolution be postponed until Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. I object. We will have a quorum then and there will be no vote on this thing. I have been through this process before.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order for a moment?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows I cannot control the entire House when I make that unanimous-consent request. The gentleman knows that I would not be a party to any effort of that nature. If the gentleman does not object, insofar as the statement by me might be observed by other Members, I hope that when we meet on Monday next nobody will make a point of order to establish a quorum to prevent the gentleman from getting a rollcall vote on the resolution and thereby compel the gentleman to get a constitutional quorum. That is all I can do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is fair that I should say that the gentleman from Massachusetts spoke to me about the fact that if any votes were to be had today they would go over to Monday. I agreed to that for reasons which seemed to be completely adequate. I might say to my friend from Iowa that I appreciate his attitude, but if I understand the situation as it exists at the moment, if he insists upon action being had at this time, of course it would be within the province of the majority leader to move that the House adjourn. The House would meet on Monday. Then, if anybody wanted to have a quorum call, which I certainly trust he would not, the gentleman could get his record vote. But if the House did adjourn over until Monday, if the thing which the gentleman fears were to come to pass by reason of the action of going over to Monday, there still would be available to anyone who wanted to exercise it the right to get a record vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Iowa has heard the gentleman from Massachusetts make the observation that he hopes nobody will make a point of order for the purpose of establishing a quorum. However, I shall move to adjourn the House if the gentleman insists; but on Monday next that will not apply. I would not feel then that my urging of all Members not to make a point of order to establish a quorum would be

applicable, because the gentleman has given me nothing in response to my effort to cooperate with him to the fullest extent of his desire.

Mr. GROSS. I will go along with the gentleman just once more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not say "once more," just say the gentleman will go along.

Mr. GROSS. Just once more.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader tell me why the vote on this matter cannot go over, and move to postpone the vote on these things until Monday? The gentleman knows very well that you could not get a record vote on it today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Far be it from me to contradict the gentleman on parliamentary law, because I recognize his superior knowledge.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not care for that kind of insult, and I object. I object, Mr. Speaker. We cannot have that statement here and get away with it. When the gentleman gets onto that kind of language, he is through as far as I am concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I have ruffled the gentleman, I am sorry. It is just a little jocular game.

I renew my unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that the further consideration of this resolution go over until Monday next?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 81, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1959, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 81, Eighty-sixth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$100,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 79) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 78, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1959, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 78, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 92) to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1959, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 127 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$200,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 1, strike out "4" and insert "3."

On line 3, strike out "127" and insert "27."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How does this compare with the appropriation of last year?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the same appropriation. The appropriation is in exactly the same amount as it was last year. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on the Judiciary returned upwards of \$10,000 of this appropriation.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 107) to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 91, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1959, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 91 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$125,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 108) providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1959, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$640,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This is \$640,000 for the Committee on Government Operations.

What was the total expenditure last year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. \$1,175,000, of which they returned around \$75,000.

Mr. GROSS. Is this just the first installment?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is for the first session.

Mr. GROSS. Is that true of all of these resolutions?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No. Not all of them. Some are for 2 years, and others are for only 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. This is just the down-payment?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is not a down-payment. They feel they need this money to continue their work. They have saved the Government over \$124 million last year alone.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear that, but I would like to see the report. I do not doubt the gentleman's word, but I would like to see the ways by which all of this money was saved.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I have it all here.

Mr. GROSS. This is just a first payment?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is for the first session.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. There is a committee appointed by the proper people on both sides to hear these various committees and decide whether their requests are justified or not. This committee unanimously decided that this amount had been justified by the committee. If the gentleman from Iowa is an expert on this matter, probably he could prevail on his side to put him on the committee, and then he could make a first-hand decision about the matter. But if a committee comes in and shows that they need this money, we will give it to them, the gentleman from Iowa notwithstanding.

Mr. GROSS. I do not intend to apologize to the gentleman from Ohio for asking questions concerning these appropriations. I will probably ask some more. I am sure we can rely on all of the committees of Congress to give us the information we want, but it is the prerogative of Members of Congress to ask questions and that I intend to do, the gentleman from Ohio notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a resolution (H. Res. 126) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 101 of the Eighty-sixth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$110,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid

out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, after the word "That" insert "effective from January 3, 1959".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 131) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-sixth Congress, the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of \$10,000) as its deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

The resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 136) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1959, the expenses of the investigations and studies conducted pursuant to H. Res. 56, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$125,000, including expenditures for employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 139) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1959, the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 133 incurred by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or as a duly authorized subcommittee, not to exceed \$300,000, including expenditures for employ-

ment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, experts, and consultants (including personnel of the Library of Congress performing services on reimbursable detail) and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or duly authorized subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield gladly.

Mr. GROSS. Is this what was known last year as the Outer Space Committee?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Last year it was a temporary committee referred to as the Outer Space Committee. The official name was the Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. This year it is a permanent committee known as the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. GROSS. How much was appropriated last year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Outer Space Committee received \$185,000 of which they returned \$90,000.

Mr. GROSS. This is a pretty substantial jump, is it not—\$300,000 as the first bite?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is very substantial. This committee deals with a very involved subject, and we do not know how much they will need. Certainly if they do not need the money they can return it.

Mr. GROSS. Again, this is the first installment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. These are not installments. We do not know whether it is enough for all their activities.

Mr. GROSS. We certainly hope so.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is a new committee and, of course, its problems are new. It is blazing a trail. If we need the services of experts from the departments they should be available. It seems to me the committee could do a good job and return some of the money in this instance.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly we need to start blazing a trail now in the matter of the economy, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana, and I hope the gentleman will do everything possible to hold down the expenditures of this committee instead of coming back here for another three, four, or five hundred thousand dollars later on.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 137) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1959, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$327,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, the Chair indicated earlier that the manager of a bill in the House, in this instance the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], may exercise his discretion as to the reason for yielding to another Member; is it correct that it is the gentleman's prerogative to inquire from the Member requesting that he yield, the purpose for which the Member makes the request? In other words, in the immediate case, the gentleman from Maryland has the right to predetermine the intent of those who wish him to yield. If to yield is for the purpose of offering an amendment to the pending bill, the gentleman may decline to yield for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has entire discretion as to whether he will yield or not and for any purpose.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman very briefly.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that again, as I have in the past, I find myself rising to vote "No" and making known my position with regard to my opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I want to congratulate some of the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities for their continual attempts to try to rectify and eliminate some of the evils that have been going on in this particular committee since its inception several years ago. I am sure it can be done. I say, without fear of disturbing the present chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities and without contradiction, that most of you who have served in the House over a long period of time will remember the day when this committee was chairmanned by former Congressman Parnell Thomas, by Congressman Martin Dies, and then by Congressman Rankin, of Mississippi. I came in during the days of Congressman Rankin's administration.

I say on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the present chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, that I remember the days in the history of the Committee on Un-

American Activities that the said gentleman put up a fight against policies and procedures of former chairmen and administrations to clean this committee up and put it on a properly functioning basis; with its conduct and procedures such that it could and would carry on its hearings and investigations with a great deal more responsibility and fairness and free from witch hunts and smear, as has been the case in the past with many well-intentioned people.

That is the day I am looking for and I hope I will be a Member of Congress long enough to vote for and be able to support this resolution.

I thank the gentleman for the 2 minutes allowed me on this resolution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For what purpose?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I was going to ask the gentleman to yield first to offer an amendment to reduce the amount of the appropriation to a more realistic figure, but I understand he does not wish to yield for that purpose.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I regret, of course, it is impossible to offer an amendment to somewhat reduce the amount of money that is being given to this committee. In the first place I would point out that the amount of money which it is receiving is in excess of the amount of money that is being given to the Committee on the Judiciary and to practically all the other standing committees of this House. However, in view of the fact this subject is foreclosed, there is no point in going into that in greater detail at this time.

May I say I agree heartily with the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER]. I hope and believe that the proper test of the sentiments of this House and its willingness to try to see that the rights of individuals are protected in our country, as well as protecting our country from the Communist conspiracy, will come on the question of whether or not we successfully either revise the mandate of the committee as indicated by a Supreme Court decision or we are able to take such other action as will assure this House that a committee will proceed within the proper limitations of its constitutional functions. I have asked and will press the chairman of the Rules Committee for a hearing on one or all of the resolutions introduced on this vital matter.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PUTNAM LETTER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, back in the early formative days of this splendid young Republic, when the American patriots were attempting to throw off the yoke of oppression of the British Crown so that they could live and enjoy the freedom so much desired by free men, there was a young man from New England who achieved everlasting renown as a great patriot. He left his plow in mid-field and took up arms against the oppressions of British autocracy. Every school child in America remembers this early American patriot as Israel Putnam.

Today America is threatened by a new form of autocracy, the United States Supreme Court. This body has set itself up as some kind of super-duper legislative body, ever encroaching more and more upon the duties and powers of the Congress set up as the legislative branch by the architects of the Constitution. During the past several years we have viewed with alarm the persistent increasing tendency of the Court to usurp the powers of the legislative branch of the Government.

This modern Court has in recent years and particularly within the last 5 years rendered decision after decision, which in the opinion of a substantial number of constitutional lawyers and jurists are in violation of the 10th amendment to the Constitution and inimical to the rights and powers of the States and to the liberties of the people.

One of the most notable and ill-conceived of these decisions is the notorious school integration case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a descendant of that great early American patriot, Mr. Carleton Putnam, also a New Englander, has again challenged autocracy.

Mr. Putnam is no southerner. I repeat, he is a New Englander, a native of New York State, and a graduate of Princeton and Columbia Universities. Therefore, he cannot be charged with southern bias. In a purely objective manner, he has forcefully and logically exposed the fallacy of that decision in a very forthright open letter to the President of the United States. And thus has rendered a great service to his native and beloved United States in an effort to preserve this Republic which his ancestor contributed so much to found.

His letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 13, 1958.
The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago I was reading over Justice Frankfurter's opinion in the recent Little Rock case. Three sentences in it tempt me to write you this letter. I am a northerner, but I have spent a large part of my life as a business executive in the South. I have a law degree, but I am now engaged in historical writing. From this observation post I risk the presumption of a comment.

The sentences I wish to examine are these: "Local customs, however hardened by time, are not decreed in heaven. Habits and feelings they engender may be counteracted

and moderated. Experience attests that such local habits and feeling will yield, gradually though this be, to law and education."

It is my personal conviction that the local customs in this case were hardened by time for a very good reason, and that while they may not, as Frankfurter says, have been decreed in heaven, they come closer to it than the current view of the Supreme Court. I was particularly puzzled by Frankfurter's remark that the Constitution is not the formulation of the merely personal views of the members of this Court. Five minutes before the Court's desegregation decision, the Constitution meant one thing; 5 minutes later, it meant something else. Only one thing intervened, namely, an expression of the personal views of the members of the Court.

It is not my purpose to dispute the point with which the greater part of Frankfurter's opinion is concerned. The law must be obeyed. But I think the original desegregation decision was wrong, that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found, not to disobey it but to avoid it. Failing this, the situation should be corrected by constitutional amendment.

I cannot agree that this is a matter involving a few States as Frankfurter suggests. The picture in reality is of a Court, by one sudden edict, forcing upon the entire South a view, and a way of life, with which the great majority of the population are in complete disagreement. Although not from the legal, in fact from the practical, standpoint the North, which does not have the problem, is presuming to tell the South, which does have the problem, what to do.

To me there is a frightening arrogance in this performance. Neither the North, nor the Court, has any holy mandate inherent in the trend of the times or the progress of liberalism to reform society in the South. In the matter of schools, rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association and, in the South at least, may require that both be considered simultaneously. (In using the word "association" here, I mean the right to associate with whom you please, and the right not to associate with whom you please.) Moreover, am I not correct in my recollection that it was the social stigma of segregation and its effect upon the Negro's mind and heart to which the Court objected as much as to any other, and thus that the Court, in forcing the black man's right to equal education was actually determined to violate the white man's right to freedom of association?

In any case the crux of this issue would seem obvious; social status has to be earned. Or, to put it another way, equality of association has to be mutually agreed to and mutually desired. It cannot be achieved by legal fiat. Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pureblooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization. Finally, he can inquire as to the number of pureblooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science. (I do not include singing or athletics as these are not primarily matters of character and intelligence.) Nor is there any validity to the argument that the Negro hasn't been given a chance. We were all in caves or trees originally. The progress which the pureblooded black has made when left to himself, with a minimum of white help or

hindrance, genetically or otherwise, can be measured today in the Congo.

Lord Bryce, a distinguished and impartial foreign observer, presented the situation accurately in his "American Commonwealth" when he wrote in 1880:

"History is a record of the progress toward civilization of races originally barbarous. But that progress has in all cases been slow and gradual. Utterly dissimilar is the case of the African Negro, caught up in and whirled along with the swift movement of the American democracy. In it we have a singular juxtaposition of the most primitive and the most recent, the most rudimentary and the most highly developed, types of culture. A body of savages is violently carried across the ocean and set to work as slaves on the plantations of masters who are three or four thousand years in advance of them in mental capacity and moral force. * * * Suddenly, even more suddenly than they were torn from Africa, they find themselves, not only free, but made full citizens and active members of the most popular Government the world has seen, treated as fit to bear an equal part in ruling, not only themselves, but also their recent masters."

One does not telescope three or four thousand years into the 78 years since Bryce wrote. One may change the terms of the problem by mixed breeding, but if ever there was a matter that ought to be left to local option it would seem to be the decision as to when the mixture has produced an acceptable amalgam in the schools. And I see no reason for penalizing a locality that does not choose to mix.

I would emphatically support improvement of education in Negro schools, if and where it is inferior. Equality of opportunity and equality before the law, when not strained to cover other situations, are acceptable ideals because they provide the chance to earn and to progress—and consequently should be enforced by legal fiat as far as is humanly possible. But equality of association, which desegregation in Southern schools involves, pre-supposes a status which in the South the average Negro has not earned. To force it upon the Southern white will, I think, meet with as much opposition as the prohibition amendment encountered in the wet States.

Throughout this controversy there has been frequent mention of the equality of man as a broad social objective. No proposition in recent years has been clouded by more loose thinking. Not many of us would care to enter a poetry contest with Keats, nor play chess with the national champion, nor set our character beside Albert Schweitzer's. When we see the doctrine of equality contradicted everywhere around us in fact, it remains a mystery why so many of us continue to give it lip service in theory, and why we tolerate the vicious notion that status in any field need not be earned.

Pin down the man who uses the word "equality," and at once the evasions and qualifications begin. As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were equal in the sight of God. I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority for this conception. There is doubtless authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God—after earning that status, and with various further qualifications—but where is the authority for the sort of ipso facto equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter. What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races.

The confusion here is not unlike the confusion created by some leftwing writers between the doctrine of equality and the doctrine of Christian love. The command to love your neighbor is not a command either to consider your neighbor your equal, or yourself his equal: perhaps the purest example of great love without equality is the love between parent and child. In fact the equality doctrine as a whole, except when surrounded by a plethora of qualifications, is so untenable that it falls to pieces, at the slightest thoughtful examination.

Frankfurter closes his opinion with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln, to whom the Negro owes more than to any other man. I, too, would like to quote from Lincoln. At Charleston, Ill., in September 1858 in a debate with Douglas, Lincoln said:

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races: I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office * * *. I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

The extent to which Lincoln would have modified these views today, or may have modified them before his death, is a moot question, but it is clear on its face that he would not have been in sympathy with the Supreme Court's decision on desegregation. Many historians have felt that when Lincoln died the South lost the best friend it had. This also may be moot, but again it seems clear that for 94 years—from the horrors of Reconstruction through the Supreme Court's desegregation decision—the North has been trying to force the black man down the white southerner's throat, and it is a miracle that relations between the races in the South have progressed as well as they have.

Perhaps the most discouraging spectacle is the spectacle of northern newspapers dwelling with pleasure upon the predicament of the southern parent who is forced to choose between desegregation and no school at all for his child. It does not seem to occur to these papers that this is the cruelest sort of blackmail; that the North is virtually putting a pistol at the head of the southern parent in a gesture which every northerner must contemplate with shame.

Indeed, there now seems little doubt that the Court's recent decision has set back the cause of the Negro in the South by a generation. He may force his way into white schools, but he will not force his way into white hearts nor earn the respect he seeks. What evolution was slowly and wisely achieving, revolution has now arrested, and the trail of bitterness will lead far.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

A STITCH IN TIME FOR UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the honor of introducing a bill which is similar to one introduced in this

body the other day by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and some 40 other Members of that body, both Democrats and Republicans. Like theirs my bill is also a bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

In my judgment no legislation is more urgently needed in the country today because of the fact that unemployment continues to haunt many of our major areas and according to surveys which have appeared recently in the press even the most encouraging economists expect that a large measure of this unemployment will continue to be with us for many months to come. It is my hope that this legislation can be acted on quickly and can be passed into law and signed by the President of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of the bill which has been introduced in this body and in the other body that seriously disturbs me and that is the requirement in section 5(a) that a community which is suffering from between 6 to 9 percent of unemployment is required to endure that level of unemployment for a period of at least 18 months before becoming eligible for the assistance and relief provided for by the legislation. I have the honor to represent in this body the great industrial center of Schenectady, one of the really great industrial centers of the United States. Schenectady has been suffering from 6 percent unemployment for a period of nearly a year, and also suffered a similar level of unemployment for more than a year during the period from May 1954 to July of 1955. Under the terms of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], Schenectady could expect no relief under this legislation until December of 1959, although two other areas in my district, Gloversville and Johnstown with 13.7 percent and Amsterdam with 18 percent, would be eligible for relief in April 1959 and in March 1959.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the requirement that a level of 6 percent unemployment must continue for a full 18 months, especially when the overall economic level is rising, is unnecessarily restrictive. We all know that a stitch in time saves nine and that sometimes a person who delays too long in getting to the doctor will arrive too late for medical assistance to do much good. I am afraid that the same situation may exist with regard to current regional unemployment. If we arbitrarily require that a community suffering for a full year in these days from this high a level of unemployment must continue to suffer that high level of unemployment for another 6 months before relief can be made available, we may be creating even more severe conditions of economic distress which will be harder to correct than if aid had been applied more quickly.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced differs in one important respect from the bill submitted by

my colleagues in that it provides that a community can qualify for assistance if it has suffered from at least 6 percent unemployment for a period of 12 months. Under my bill we can get the relief going more quickly, Mr. Speaker, to those areas of the country which need it, and we can be hopeful that the doctor will arrive before the patient has expired.

I urge my colleagues in this body and the other body and the distinguished members of the committees who will be considering this legislation to give this matter their earnest and favorable consideration.

FOOD FOR PEACE RESOLUTION: AMERICAN FARM PRODUCTION A FORCE FOR FREEDOM AND PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in 1958 the American farmer again demonstrated his productive genius by harvesting one of the largest crops in our Nation's history despite severe acreage limitations. This bounteous production is the envy of a world in which two-thirds of the population is undernourished.

Clearly recognizing the potent role of food in a hungry world, Soviet Premier Khrushchev has called for a gigantic agricultural development program, including the cultivation of some 90 million acres of marginal virgin lands, in an attempt to put the Soviet Union ahead of America in the production of food. Ironically enough, our Secretary of Agriculture and many other Americans simultaneously bemoan our mountainous surpluses as the number one problem facing the American farmer.

It is my own strong conviction that, properly utilized, our agricultural abundance can be a blessing to us and to the world. Surplus food can be a great instrument to relate our spiritual heritage and moral precepts to a suffering mankind. Surely we do not want to hide the candle of compassion under our bushels of surplus food. Would we not better fulfill our role as a great democratic Nation by following the timeless advice:

Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy.

PARADOX OF HUNGER AND ABUNDANCE

I feel strongly that the tragic paradox of abundance in a world of need stems largely from narrow vision. Instead of viewing our agricultural wealth as a positive tool of foreign policy, we have adopted the attitude that foreign food programs are merely a way—and a rather ineffective one at that—to siphon off agricultural surpluses. Let me quote from the President's budget message:

Sales of farm commodities for foreign currencies under title I of this act (the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act) and donations of commodities for relief purposes under title II have provided

a temporary method of coping with some of the continuing excess production of farm commodities.

Instead of congratulating the farmer for his industry and positive contribution to America's wealth and world influence the budget message complains that:

The continuing heavy impact of agricultural programs on the budget is mainly the result of the continued high volume of agricultural production and our long established and now largely outmoded system of farm price supports. . . . The system provides production incentives that impede needed adjustments and encourages the production of surpluses which, in turn, result in increased Government outlays for commodity loans and purchases, and for storage and interest costs.

The pressing needs in many areas of the world and the lagging Western response has been described by many observers but never more pungently than by Comdr. Sir Robert Jackson in the October 1958 issue of Foreign Affairs. The author's wide experience as an administrator in underdeveloped areas gives his words a ring of urgency and authenticity:

It is a heartbreaking experience to live with people who so clearly need assistance, and at the same time to know that the great mass of people in the West would respond immediately if they, too, could have the same first-hand knowledge. Here is a great tragedy in the failure of human communications, and increasingly clear evidence that our political institutions have so far shown themselves incapable of dealing effectively with one of the basic problems of our age.

Must one be driven to believe that we have lost our sense of reality and that we can no longer recognize the obvious? Can we visualize only the inhuman outline of the hydrogen bomb, and not see the obvious needs of hundreds of millions of people all over the world who ask nothing more than that we should give them a hand in time so that they can become persons with a future and so help to evolve a better world?

We talk mostly of these problems in international terms and in terms of national policies and governments. But never let us forget that the ultimate objective is the individual—the ordinary man and woman and child the world over—who asks only that we should preserve life and give hope for the future.

As each day goes by, and still the West fails to respond, the attitude of governments and people in the less developed countries changes—perhaps imperceptibly, but it changes. At present, it seems to me, it is moving slowly, but as relentlessly as lava from a volcano, away from the West. If that process continues, the uncommitted areas will not long remain uncommitted and the doors of Asia and Africa will be closed to the West.

In the last analysis, and when all is said, one is left with the belief that this problem will never be resolved until the majority of people in the West are ready to answer strongly and affirmatively when that most fundamental of all questions is asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Here is the test of our faith, of our conscience, of our innermost belief in the usefulness and purpose of our own lives. Today we still have the opportunity to act in a way which would do much to achieve peace and security for a large part of the world, and justify our own existence. Will we accept that challenge or will we prove once more that "where there is no vision the people perish"?

PUBLIC LAW 480 A GOOD BEGINNING

A beginning, and I think a significant beginning, has been made in the utilization of our farm abundance under the auspices of Public Law 480 which was passed by Congress in 1954 in spite of what amounted to cool opposition from the executive branch. Under this act, between 1954 and July 1, 1958, farm commodities worth \$3,934,000,000 in terms of U.S. market prices were withdrawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation's storage bins and put into the hands of foreign peoples whose need was great. Of this amount, by the terms of title III, \$622,000 in foodstuffs have been distributed by nonprofit American voluntary relief organizations and such intergovernmental organizations as UNICEF. Church groups of all denominations have vigorously participated in the program and have testified to its important contribution with great enthusiasm. Several years ago Monsignor Swanstrom of the Catholic Relief Services testified:

I have seen the surplus products of our midwestern farms relieving misery in the heart of Pakistan; I have seen our sharing of the bounty of America's produce bring smiles of friendship to the faces of those in southern Italy who, in despair, had been flirting with communism, and I have seen the incredulity with which these gifts from the people of America were first greeted in the Far East where the whole concept of aid to one's neighbor had not previously existed.

Rev. R. Norris Wilson, of the Church World Service of the National Council of the Churches of Christ had this to say:

There is, of course, no question as to the tremendous value of these surplus sharing programs, both to our people and to those receiving materials. There can be no more effective or certain way, certainly none, that is so inexpensive, for America to demonstrate her feeling of friendship for other nations of the world, no other way so perfectly for the people-to-people concept to be spread, no other way in which the unique American ethic of human brotherhood can be brought into understanding by other people.

These accomplishments of the last 4 years are commendable, but in respect to American resources, world needs, and the possible benefits to U.S. foreign policy, they are indeed embryonic. Despite efforts to hold down production, according to the President's economic report, by June 30, 1959, there will be a record carryover of 1.3 billion bushels of wheat, or more than 2 years domestic requirements. There will also be large stocks of corn, rice, cotton, tobacco, oils, fats, dairy products and other goods. Here are the instruments with which we can build a sound economic foreign policy to promote peace, stability and free institutions. Moreover, these building stones for world peace and economic well-being will be available in the years ahead. Technological advances will insure that agricultural production will continue to outrace projected population growth.

FOOD SURPLUSES AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

While proposals to broaden the use of our farm products overseas ought to be motivated in large measure by concern for our fellow man, they are also predicated on the conviction that so-called

agricultural surpluses can be a most potent arm of our foreign policy. This is not wishful thinking, but a realistic projection based on actual experience to date.

In a careful review of our Public Law 480 operations following a world tour to study this program, Harvard Economist John H. Davis concluded that success of the law "testifies as to the challenge that exists for the future; to utilize surplus farm products as a positive force for promoting international peace and security." Dr. Davis concluded that:

The potential of Public Law 480 as a tool for implementing foreign policy objectives far exceeds that foreseen in 1954 when the act was passed. (Address before a joint meeting of the American Farm Economic Association and the Canadian Agricultural Society, Winnipeg, Canada, August 20, 1958.)

The overall impact of our Public Law 480 program with some exciting recommendations for further implementation was evaluated last spring by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT HUMPHREY. In a challenging report entitled "Food and Fiber as a Force for Freedom," Senator HUMPHREY, who has led the way in this field, stated:

America's abundance of food and fiber is a tremendous asset in the world's struggle for peace and freedom. * * * Food is the common denominator of international life. * * * A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger could be more significant in the cold war than the conquest of outer space. * * * Bread, not guns, may well decide mankind's future destiny. Thanks to our farm people, the United States is in a far better position than Russia to lead the world toward the conquest of hunger and want. (Report to the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. Senate, April 21, 1958.)

After the adoption of Public Law 480, the United States regained the approximate proportion of world trade that it enjoyed in the late 1940's and which it had lost in 1952 and 1953. Without this program, the U.S. share of farm exports would have been considerably smaller over the past 4 years. Not only have we retained our share of the world market but through many of the programs operating under Public Law 480, we are developing future outlets. Market development is one of the stated aims of this legislation.

I must emphasize that although it has provisions to aid the needy, this is not an international giveaway program. The great bulk of products have been sold for foreign currencies which have been used quite profitably—measured in terms of a farsighted foreign policy—as loans for multilateral trade and economic development, for common defense, for market development, for the payment of U.S. obligations, for educational exchange, and for other important uses.

Furthermore, when one considers that Commodity Credit Corporation storage losses averaged nearly \$20 million a year between 1954 and 1957, and that the average storage cost in 1957 stood at approximately a million dollars a day, the stated budget expenses for Public Law 480 are greatly reduced. By December 1957 the costs to the Commodity

Credit Corporation until title I of Public Law 480 totaled \$2,571 million. However, the estimated losses and storage costs which would have accrued on these supplies came to \$2,332 million. Therefore the actual costs to the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I were only \$239 million during the first 3 years of operations. When one considers the uses to which counterpart currencies were put, the costs actually are transformed into profits.

CONGRESSMAN POAGE CALLS FOR LONG-TERM FOOD CREDITS

As Congress reviews Public Law 480 during this session, I am hopeful that we will widen the horizon of this vital program. A long stride forward would be taken by enactment of H.R. 2420, introduced by a most able and courageous champion of agriculture and world peace, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. This measure would enhance the effectiveness of our foreign economic aid policy by assuring underdeveloped countries a stable supply of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption on long term credit during periods of economic development. I am introducing similar legislation which I believe is a valuable addition to Public Law 480. Typical of the nations which could profit greatly from such legislation are India, Pakistan, and Ghana. These countries provide challenging examples of friendly, free nations that are undergoing a period of rapid industrialization which is crucial for their national well-being, but which is putting an enormous strain on their economic resources. A painful shortage of food and disastrous price inflation are the natural concomitants of industrial payrolls in the developing countries. Indeed, unless the quantity of food can be increased, an expanding industrial payroll is a serious inflationary threat. Furthermore, available dollar exchange is required for capital investments rather than food and clothing if economic development is to move ahead.

If the United States intends to preserve the integrity of the free world we must provide these nations during their heroic struggle for betterment with necessary foodstuffs from our overflowing granaries so that we relieve some of the pressures on their own economies. This could be accomplished by legislation similar to the proposals by Mr. POAGE and myself. This legislation recognizes that we must assure the developing nations long term food supplies. They must be able to depend on such supplies rather than awaiting a year by year extension depending on the annual mood of Congress.

NEED FOR BOLD ADMINISTRATION

Other measures may be taken to broaden Public Law 480 and put it on a more permanent basis. Four years of experience have demonstrated, however, that no matter how sound a program, its degree of success bears a direct relationship to the vigor, boldness, and imagination of its administrators. While I do not wish to be unduly critical, there appears to be a hesitation, an overly cautious, reluctant approach, which has severely restrained the scope of this op-

eration. The agricultural attaché can hardly be blamed for not seeking out new markets when he lacks positive direction from home. We need a vigorous and convinced leadership which will stimulate a spirit of adventure and a sense of dedication in all persons connected with the program.

Unfortunately, during the latter half of 1957, and during 1958, exports of farm products shipped under Public Law 480 dropped sharply. In fiscal 1958 total agricultural exports declined by 15 percent. In 1958, 30 percent of farm products were shipped under special programs, mostly under Public Law 480, as compared to 40 percent in 1957.

BARTER PROGRAM

The barter program under title III of Public Law 480 by which American farm products were bartered for strategic materials of a readily storable nature came to a virtual halt in May 1957. While the 85th Congress passed a law directing the Secretary of Agriculture to barter "to the maximum extent possible" the present rate of \$55.6 million in barter contracts negotiated between January and June 1958, compares very unfavorably with the average 6-month rate of \$145 million between mid-1954 and mid-1957. The administration's excuse that barter tends to replace cash sales did not hold up under committee questioning, and, in fact, there is evidence that the coupling of barter and cash sales tends to stimulate the latter.

In addition to bartering for strategic materials, the barter provisions of title III could also serve as a very effective and flexible foreign policy tool to relieve temporary economic pressures bearing on nations largely dependent on the output of one or two primary—mineral—products. These materials can be stored without loss, and quite cheaply, compared to the food products they replace. This is an area of international relations in which the U.S.S.R. continually outmaneuvers us, even though we have the means to compete with her readily available.

AMERICAN FOOD SURPLUS NEED NOT JEOPARDIZE OTHER FOOD EXPORTING NATIONS

There appears to be apprehension on the part of the administration, and particularly the State Department, that Public Law 480 will disrupt normal trade channels and antagonize other agricultural exporting nations such as Canada and Australia. Provisions of the law make this highly unlikely and no cases of such disruptions have been proven. There would appear to be considerable room left for expansion of agricultural exports outside normal trade channels. To allay the fears of these friendly nations and to extend to them the very real benefits of this program, I would suggest that we invite them to cooperate in a mutual food-for-peace project.

I urge our administration leaders to revise their myopic view of this extremely important program. Our agricultural surplus is not primarily a budgetary headache. Its most dangerous implication is the unfortunate image of an America wringing her hands over her

food abundance in full view of a hungry, suffering mankind that is trying to find a way to secure bread without sacrificing freedom.

FOOD FOR PEACE RESOLUTION

This Congress, I believe, should express its urgent desire to resolve the paradox of want in the midst of abundance. We should accelerate our efforts to cancel out some of the surplus of empty stomachs in the world with the surplus of food.

Toward that end I offer a "food for peace" resolution. A similar resolution is being introduced in the other body by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY. Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas the abundance of food and fiber produced by the American farmer is the marvel of the world; and

Whereas most of the people of the world are undernourished; and

Whereas the American people historically have been concerned with the well-being of other peoples; and

Whereas in many nations of the free world vital economic development programs are retarded and political stability is threatened by an inadequate supply of food; and

Whereas the remarkable bounty of the free American farmer has resulted in accumulations of farm commodities for which there is insufficient domestic demand; and

Whereas the Congress seeks to reduce unnecessary expenditures, including, where possible, those for commodity storage and for foreign assistance; and

Whereas the Soviet bloc has publicly challenged the United States and her allies to economic competition in demonstrating before the world the viability of their respective economic systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that an agricultural abundance is one of America's greatest assets for raising living standards and promoting peace and stability in the free world; and that Congress favors action to resolve the paradox of American agricultural surpluses and world food needs by more fully utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of the United States' foreign assistance program.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution may be cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and make a few remarks relative to our surplus food. I have noted with pleasure the resolution which has been introduced today by my colleague, the Honorable GEORGE McGOVERN, urging that Congress initiate action to resolve the problem of our great food surpluses and world food needs by utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of our foreign aid program. I, too, am introducing a similar resolution today.

The growing moral resurgence in America compels us to make a vigorous effort to find solutions to the economic distress of many friendly nations. We

have in our own country a costly bounty which could be turned to our advantage and to that of the hungry peoples of the world. On November 18 of last year it was my pleasure to speak before the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers at Hutchinson, Kans., at which time I advocated that our surplus foods be sent abroad to raise the living standards of hungry nations and to scale down foreign aid costs in this country by substituting food for dollars. We are spending approximately \$38 to \$40 billion per year in an effort to stop the advance of communism, or to protect ourselves and our free world friends from the Communist threat. I think it is our solemn moral obligation and responsibility to find the right solution to this problem of surplus food. Divine Providence has bestowed upon us the resources and the knowledge to produce. It is the American way to produce more and better, and we will, of course, continue in that way. At the same time, it is shocking to know that in our own country many people go to bed at night hungry without having had enough to eat. It is sickening to the soul to know that throughout the world, the aged and young children, the innocent, lie down in poverty and die every day, the slow death of starvation. Surplus food? No, I refuse to call it surplus. How could it be surplus when countless thousands are dying because they do not have it. It is a result of ever-increasing production, and of our failure to meet and solve the problem of distribution. The world and its hungry people are a ready market for our food production. We have food which we cannot consume, and we will continue to have food in such quantity.

Throughout this world today, there are countless numbers of God's people who have not even a spoonful of food. If we do not solve this dilemma of the bulging granaries and the empty spoons, then frankly, I fear for us.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this resolution should be adopted:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that an agricultural abundance is one of America's greatest assets for raising living standards and promoting peace and stability in the free world; and that Congress favors action to resolve the paradox of American agricultural surpluses and world food needs by more fully utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of the United States foreign assistance program and this resolution be cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution."

MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Armed Services Committee today to propose an extension of the draft for only 2 years rather than accept the administration's proposal for a 4-year extension.

Coincident to this bill I am introducing a concurrent resolution which calls for a 14-member joint committee which shall have a life of 18 months and shall conduct a full and complete investigation of, first, military conscription and reserve policies; second, possible alternatives to the military conscription system.

This joint committee is of paramount importance today for there are real questions as to the necessity of the draft and whether the present draft and reserve programs are the right kind to give us maximum security in an age of complex military technology.

Perhaps we are fooling ourselves into thinking we are aiding our national defense through the military conscription program. Perhaps our military procurement policies gives us quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security.

I sincerely believe that by extending the draft for 2 years we are protecting ourselves, at the very least, according to the military theories presently accepted by the administration. However, by not extending the draft and reserve programs for 4 years we are showing that we will not continue a conscription policy unless we have facts which show that this is the only kind of system that will enable us to achieve maximum national security. By having a joint committee investigation thoroughly study for 18 months military procurement policies and alternatives we are showing that we are not willing to cover up what might have been our mistakes in the past and what could become our fatal blunders in the future.

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE LEONARD G. WOLF, OF IOWA, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTION OF THE DRAFT, JANUARY 29, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am LEONARD WOLF, Congressman from the Second District of Iowa. I thank the chairman and the committee for the opportunity to appear before you in support of my amendment to H.R. 2260. My amendment, if enacted into law, will extend until July 1, 1961, the authority to induct persons under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. I am also introducing a concurrent resolution which will establish a joint congressional committee composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives who will undertake a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces; and (2) the alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the personnel strength requisite for national security. Now I should like to explain why a number of my colleagues and I question a blanket 4-year extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Seldom, if ever, has there been a time in our history when it was more important for us to be strong militarily and to have an impregnable defense posture. Not only is it important to the United States but it is important to the entire free world. It will also demonstrate to the Communist world that we are constantly improving our military position. We are certain that no Member of Congress disagrees with the importance and necessity of our being militarily

strong. There is, however, apparent disagreement as to how we should achieve and promote a defense system which will deter any would-be aggressor while maintaining our basic freedoms. Because of this disagreement it is of paramount importance that we review, reinvestigate, and reconsider certain of the basic assumptions inherent in our present military system.

There is no phase of our Military Establishment which demands more general review and discussion than our military conscription system.

Many responsible military leaders feel that the maximum strength of the Armed Forces cannot be maintained without the pressure of a Selective Service System. Consequently, no hasty action should be taken which would immediately end the draft. But, on the other hand, we cannot afford, either politically, morally, militarily, or socially, a mere blanket 4-year extension of the draft which will freeze into our military system until 1963 the present inefficiencies which are so much a part of the system which has come to be universal only in its discriminations, effective only in the perpetuation of the untested premise that there are no other effective alternatives to attract men to the armed services. I firmly believe that some of the arguments against conscription are so sound and raise such important questions that in the interest of both national security for the United States and freedom of our citizens we are forced to reconsider the administration request for a 4-year extension. Rather, I suggest a 2-year extension, during which a joint committee will, hopefully, seek rational alternatives to the present conscription method.

1. One of the most telling points against our Selective Service System is an economic argument. At the present time, the Federal Government spends as much as \$14,000 for the training of each draftee. The present high turnover of military personnel who are drafted constitute a great waste of the taxpayers' money, adds to our mounting cost of national defense, and exerts an inflationary pressure on our whole economy. When these men leave the armed services, not only do millions of the taxpayers' dollars leave the service with them, but the services are then faced with the task of beginning all over again with training green recruits. B. H. Liddell Hart, the British strategist and military historian, in his book "Defense of the West" argues that the cost of training conscripts and other costs caused by the rapid turnover of short-time soldiers are not exceeded by gains in military power and military security. He states "conscripts cannot be trained in 18 months or 2 years to the high grade of skill required for modern warfare for by the time they are trained to even an 'employment' level, so little of their period of service remains that their employment is bad economy." Furthermore, conscription "heavily handicaps the regulars and their effective utilization for a very large proportion of them are absorbed directly or indirectly into the training machine for conscripts, and in 'caretaker' jobs at home and overseas." Many of the tasks which are performed by draftees and those who become regulars through enlistment could very well be performed by civilians. For example, the Air Force put into practice a few years ago a project known as Project Native Son. The project called for the replacement of a military man by an indigenous civilian in those tasks which could be performed just as well by civilians. According to a report in "Aviation Week," September 6, 1954, the Air Force was able to relieve 43,000 military personnel for a new combat unit through the replacement of these men with only 31,000 civilian foreign nationals. Clearly, if such a program can be undertaken abroad and be successful, an even larger program using American citi-

zens may profitably be undertaken in the United States. At the very least a study should be made of the possibility.

The Cordiner Report, prepared at the request of the President, points out that only approximately 3 out of 100 draftees reenlist after their 2-year term ends. Mr. Cordiner underscores Liddell Hart's view when he states that the advance in "modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialist in 2 years." Mr. Cordiner also notes that these men, just at the moment they become useful, leave the service. This brings to mind two other important and enlightening statements presented in the Cordiner Report. Cordiner stated, after talking to hundreds of enlisted men, "I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They (the men) were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who do not stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks." Furthermore, the accident rate is very high because of the inexperience of men who use and man intricate weapons. The Armed Forces themselves estimate that close to \$5 billion worth of equipment has been rendered useless because of these inexperienced men, according to the Cordiner Report. It is no wonder that now men who enter the 6-month program are not given any inkling of the use of modern weapons for fear they will damage the equipment. This, of course, raises the question of the merit of a program or system which now prepares men for the kind of war that was fought in 1939.

The most obvious point made against military conscription is that it is based on compulsion and, therefore, is alien to American traditions because our society is based on the voluntary actions of free individuals. Yet we all recognize that during other great national emergencies democratic standards and ideals have had to be protected through the use of military conscription. This was accepted by our citizens during the Second World War because of the immediate necessity for mass armies and because conscription was universally applied. But under the present Selective Service System, more than one-half of the men in the eligible age group have, by a combination of circumstances and means, including deferment, been excused from any form of military service. A large part of the burden of conscription has fallen unfairly upon youths who for economic reasons are unable to obtain draft deferments. These men are those who cannot afford to attend college or who must postpone marriage and the raising of a family. It is indeed an unfortunate thing when society aids its young men through devious means to avoid their draft obligation. According to John Graham, in a study prepared for the Fund for the Republic, there are as many as 60 ways for a young man to fulfill his military obligation without actually serving his time in the draft. For example, in early 1957 the pool of draft age men was about 5 million, of whom 2.3 million were fathers who, consequently, are indefinitely deferred under draft regulations. Conscientious objectors are deferred; many professional athletes are disqualified because of physical handicaps; college students are deferred; scientists, for the most part, are deferred. By Executive order set forth in January 1956, men past 26 years of age are dropped to the bottom of the draft list. This has the effect of releasing these men from their military obligation. I am not arguing that these people should not be deferred. However, it is clear that the so-called universality of the system is nonexistent. Married students in college often have children to avoid going into the draft. Those who are unable to avoid the draft because of economic or social circumstances are the ones who must enter the

Army at pay rates much lower than those prevailing in civilian life, thereby adding to their own economic burdens and delaying their own efforts to overcome their relatively low economic status. Prof. John Galbraith of Harvard has asserted that "the draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer who benefits by lower taxes to the impecunious young draftee." We are willing to have quantity with the illusion of protection rather than quality with the reality of security. As Mr. Cordiner has pointed out in his now famous report, the modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able at present and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force."

There is an apparent lack of enthusiasm for the present Reserve forces program. This is clearly understandable. New weapons have altered radically our national military strategy, and in so doing they have reduced our need for masses of military manpower. Be it right or wrong—and this question may well be one which would have to be reevaluated along with a basic review of our military manpower policies—our national military strategy now assumes that a major war fought with weapons of mass destruction would be brought to a decision in a relatively short period of time. These weapons of mass destruction, delivered by long-range bombers and ballistics missiles, supposedly would render mass armies obsolete. And if mass armies will be obsolete in a future war, so will those Reserve arms from which our mass armies are built. One justification for large Reserve forces, a justification which figures in prominence in the establishment of the 6-month program, is that in case of another Korea the necessary forces could be mobilized quickly from the military Reserve. However, the development and adoption of small-yield nuclear weapons for tactical use have supposedly led the Department of Defense and the administration to conclude that even in limited war modern technology reduces the need for masses of men. Even if this is not true, can it be honestly said by anyone in the military that the 6-month program as it is presently constituted gives the enlisted man enough opportunity and training in the use of nuclear weapons so that he would be combat-ready in such a war? Do any of us have any illusions about a 6-month Reserve program or the Air Force 10-week training? Does anyone believe that these men are learning what must be learned about complex weapons and weapons systems which are necessary in either a tactical war or a total war? It would be impossible to teach these men in such a short time and have them of use to our national security. Here is an example of what I mean: Writing in the Nation, May 10, 1958, Eric Pearl, a veteran of the 6-month program, states: "I was to learn nothing more than how to turn a radio on and how to shut one off, turn it on, shut it off, on, off. It required simulation, dedication, and no skill. I couldn't help sharing the guilt of my superiors for having let me get away with all this; and as I used to sit and look about my classroom at the many B.A.'s, and M.A.'s and LL. B.'s who were turning on and shutting off their radios, or as I looked through the window at the even greater number who were policing the area

outside I could not stop myself from thinking of what a waste of talent it all was."

After all, not much can be accomplished in 10 weeks, 6 months, or 2 years when one considers the bewildering complexities of modern military technology, especially when the men in the program, both teachers and trainees, have no interest or intention of staying in the service. As the great historian Walter Mills has stated, and as was underscored at these hearings a few days ago by General Curtis LeMay, "If we ever mobilized 37 infantry and armored divisions envisaged by the 1955 Reserve Act it seems most unlikely that we could transport or supply them over railways, through ports, and across beaches smoldering and radioactive from the nuclear fires. The ground soldier is thought of today primarily as an instrument for limited or brush fire wars; as such, he is scarcely any longer a ground soldier but must be air transportable, which limits his numbers severely. Military men now pretty generally believe that any major war will have to be fought to the end with whatever was ready at the beginnings—and that means combat-ready. If we should again be required to mobilize great masses of manpower, comparable to the 15 million men raised in 1941-45, most of them would have to be trained to complex technical skills not usually acquirable from the kind of training one gets in boot camp or in National Guard and Reserve units."

An argument which must be examined and met through extended study is the notion that the draft laws encourage enlistments in branches of services other than the Army. Although there are no clear answers to this as yet, I have certain comments about this. One might conjecture and feel reasonably safe in stating that those men who enlist in other services in order to avoid the draft will not reenlist after their 3-year period. We may find a clue for stating this in the fact that many college students enter ROTC in order to escape being enlisted men. However, at least 73 percent of those in ROTC programs quit the minute their compulsory tour of duty is up. This, in itself, is a shocking thing. Hundreds of boys who enter officer training programs are there for no other reason than they do not want to lead an enlisted man's life. Is this the way to develop dedicated, thoughtful and responsible military leaders? Just as some men enter ROTC programs to escape being enlisted men, so it is that other men enter 3-year enlisted programs and leave them after 3 years to escape Army service for 2 years. This is supported, for example, by the fact that only 8 percent of first term enlistees reenlisted in 1955. If this is true, the Army may well ask itself whether its contention is more sophistic than sound, for again, it is questionable whether 3-year enlistees are so much better than 2-year draftees, when you recognize that 3-year men aren't staying either. If it is not the case, then one of our basic reasons for continuing the draft is unsound.

Finally, there is the question of individual liberty which must be considered. In a democracy and especially in the United States, we try to protect as many voluntary actions on the part of the individual as is conceivably possible while guaranteeing a well-ordered and secure society. In the past, war has made it necessary to suspend, in part, the voluntary aspect of our society. We are still doing this in our draft system; not as a result of the pressures of war but because of what might be a fundamental fear in actually facing up to the weakness of our present military system. This kind of fear, I need not tell you, could lead to the ultimate decline of the entire free world. Furthermore, it should be made clear that each time we suspend a voluntary action of an individual or a group of individuals, without examining closely whether or not we

have to suspend the voluntary action, we are destroying that which has made the American form of government unique among nations. To arguments of this kind can be added many others. For example, it can hardly be expected that men living in a free and voluntary society who are forced involuntarily into military life for a fixed period of time will, by and large, be deeply motivated to give their best efforts while they wear a uniform, especially when there is no apparent reason for their being in uniform, when the tasks they perform have no relation to modern warfare. As Maj. Gen. Harold R. Maddux, who directs the Defense Department's division of manpower requirements, said in May 1958, " * * * We need dramatic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the Nation. We can't get that change with huge numbers of men compelled to serve against their will."

John Graham has pointed out, "uncertainties about the draft make it impossible for young men to plan ahead and, as a result, discourage them from getting the advanced training in the sciences or professions that the country is needing increasingly." The feeling of loss, of insecurity, and uselessness is compounded for thousands and thousands of young men who are already caught up with the bewildering and perplexing problems of adolescence and young adulthood. In brief, there are many political, economic, and strategic reasons for believing that our Nation's military manpower problems would be solved best by the abolition of conscription and by reliance on a highly trained, highly skilled, and well-paid Army. The Cordiner report has recommended some ways in which such an army might be brought into existence. This report, however, did not adequately consider the problem of attracting men into service through higher incentives. It did suggest that a complete analysis and investigation be undertaken for the increase in quantity and quality of housing for military men and their families. The committee also urged more study of fringe benefits which would play an important role in maintaining and attracting a high caliber of men who would stay in the service for a longer period than either 2 or 3 years. It should be noted that when Congress increased the fringe benefits for members already in the armed services in 1955-56 the reenlistment rate climbed 10 percent or almost twice the reenlistment level of the previous year. This certainly suggests that even more use of fringe benefits and incentives will attract and keep the kind of men necessary to protect the free world.

Clearly, the Cordiner report represents only a beginning of the studies which must be made before it is feasible to abolish conscription—as inefficient and inequitable as it may be. However, the Cordiner report shows that it is high time that we agree to re-examine all of the premises upon which our conscription method is based. Our greatest need with respect to national military manpower policy is a full-scale review of the problems, alternatives, and solutions which relate to this vital national security issue. This must be made lest we drift with the compounding errors and inequities of our conscription policies.

Consequently, I am suggesting in a concurrent resolution that it is the responsibility and policy of the Congress to use all means possible to better provide for the common defense through the modernization of our military system in a manner calculated to promote maximum freedom for the individual and greater national security for the society. It can best do this through the establishment of a joint congressional committee which will review our conscription methods and possible alternatives to it during the next 18 months. This committee, I hope, will be comprised of members of the

great Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, members of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and Senate, and the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate.

In conjunction with my proposed committee, I am asking that the present Selective Service and Reserve Forces Act be extended for only 2 years, during which time this committee will be able to delve deeply and comprehensively into the manifold problems of our present military system. Then after a thorough study of the recommendations of this committee we can decide on whether or not the draft is to be extended or whether there are better alternatives to it.

I thank this committee for the time given to me; and I thank especially the distinguished chairman, Mr. VINSON, for his help and understanding.

DRINKING ON AIRLINES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the practice of serving alcoholic beverages, sometimes for free, to passengers on some flights of our major airlines is fraught with danger.

No major disaster has been traced to this as yet, but I do not believe we should wait for the inevitable tragedy to jolt us out of our complacency.

If a person wants to drink in his home, or in an establishment reserved for that purpose, that is his right under our laws. But when that freedom, and the unpredictable behavior that is sometimes occasioned by it, threatens the safety and possibly the lives of other people aboard an airplane in flight, it becomes a dangerous luxury that we cannot afford.

The most telling point in this controversy is that those who are responsible for the safety of the passengers, namely the airline pilots, stewards, and stewardesses, are opposed to this dangerous practice. The problem deserves our serious consideration.

In order to get both sides of the question, I recommend the article titled "Drinking on Airlines?" which appeared in the December 1958 issue of *Together*, the midmonth magazine for Methodist families. Although I am not a member of that denomination, I share their concern on this issue. Under unanimous consent, I bring this thoughtful article to your attention:

DRINKING ON AIRLINES?

(By Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transport Association of America)

Speed and safety are two dominating reasons for the rapid rise of airline travel. But a third also must be recognized: the airlines' responsiveness to the desires of its passengers.

The proposal to limit by law the serving of liquor on planes would mark a partial return to prohibition which was rejected by a solid majority of citizens in 1933 when the 18th amendment was repealed.

As a public-service industry, we have the responsibility to serve well not only the

postal service and the national defense, but also the foreign and domestic commerce.

Backed by their traditional philosophy of service to passengers, airlines provide beverage service on some flights. In this, they are not unique in the transportation field for alcoholic beverages also are served on trains and steamships.

The same desire to serve the public motivates airlines to offer other services. Special meals are provided for diabetics or other passengers on restricted diets, to meet religious preferences; baby-food kits are on hand for traveling infants and cooked-to-order steaks for the gourmet. And for the sick, stretcher facilities are available.

Though the majority of passengers approve serving liquor, let us examine the objections of those who do not.

First are those either moral or religious in nature. We are well aware that consumption of alcoholic beverages is prohibited in the doctrines of a number of religious groups. We respect their beliefs. But, on the other hand, many other groups have neither religious nor moral objections to drinking. With these groups we also have no quarrel. Though protecting the individual's right to drink or not to drink, the airlines oppose any lack of morality which would result from excesses.

But these are all subjective views and are not basic in any consideration by Congress of whether alcoholic beverages should be served on aircraft.

All parties to this difference of view agree, I believe, that alcoholic beverages should not be served if such service is in any way a compromise with the safety of flight operations. We are convinced that it does not and there has been no evidence which has in any way changed our position or viewpoint.

Were safety at stake, the Federal agencies responsible for airline operations would not permit service of alcohol. Even more important, the airlines themselves, with their records and reputations for safe operations at stake, would be the first to reject liquor service if it posed any hazard.

In more than 20 years since U.S. airlines began serving alcoholic beverages, there has not been a single accident which has been traced to drinking on planes.

Why, then, is there a problem? It dates back to the summer of 1954 when the Air Line Pilots Association first questioned the service of alcoholic beverages on air carrier aircraft and later were supported by the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association.

That summer, a letter from the pilots to the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) set off an investigation which, according to the Board, "did not disclose any incident in which the serving of alcoholic beverages in air carrier operations might have jeopardized flight safety." Nor has a continuing investigation by the Board since disclosed any. Investigation and monitoring of the situation by the Civil Aeronautics Administration has disclosed none, either.

Then—on three occasions during 1954-55—the CAB asked the pilots to give it factual information, but got no answer. Yet, at the same time, the pilots issued public statements listing alleged incidents. On January 3, 1956, the Board sought facts from the pilots and again found no hazard involved.

Still again, in July 1957, the Board called upon the pilot and stewardess groups, along with the Air Transport Association, to cite flight-safety jeopardy incidents connected with service or consumption of liquor.

Ultimately, the pilots listed 34 incidents alleged to have a bearing on safety. Investigation of each showed that, of the incidents, in only six was liquor service aloft said to be a factor. Of the six, three were not reported to the airline; one could not be traced due to insufficient data; one was obviously incorrect since the airline in question had never served liquor on domestic flights. The one remaining occurred on an

international flight during which a passenger became difficult because he had consumed liquor before boarding the aircraft and concealed this from the airline's personnel.

In short, the CAB has carefully investigated every case cited to it—by the pilots and stewardesses—as well as by over 2,000 individuals. Not once has it found a relationship between liquor service and safety.

Actually, the matter of alcoholic-beverage service is one of airline regulation, and the U.S. domestic airlines that do serve liquor subscribe to a voluntary industry code. This limits passengers to two drinks and provides that service will be refused if the situation so requires.

I am familiar with the Methodist Church's stand on liquor, for I am a lifelong member and have served as lay leader and official board chairman of the Potomac Methodist Church. But the airlines must face up to facts as they are. Since repeal of the 18th amendment, liquor may be served legally in the United States. Since no safety hazard has ever been proved, we must discount this argument against the service of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft.

Giving services desired by passengers is traditional with airlines. We, therefore, consider that a dignified and moderate alcoholic-beverage service, available to those who desire it, is in keeping with our philosophy.

PASSENGERS WHO DRINK CREATE UNNECESSARY RISK

(By Helen Chase, secretary, Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Association)

We of the ALSSA believe no one should drink while a passenger on a commercial airliner.

I could speak as a Methodist—for I happen to be one—but instead I join this discussion as an officer of the organized stewardesses to present our viewpoint.

In recent years, alcoholic beverages have been offered, both free (cost covered in the purchase of the flight ticket), and for sale on airlines. Each year an increasing proportion of flights have become liquor flights. It is still true, however, that most flights are run without benefit of cocktails, and on those that do serve, there is usually a limit of two cocktails per passenger.

In this situation, as in past instances, we of ALSSA want to be fair with all parties involved. Therefore, we feel it is an accurate appraisal of the situation to say that, while this problem actually occurs only in a small minority of scheduled airline flights, it is still an important problem—one that deserves the attention of everyone concerned.

I have been a stewardess for 13 years. During recent years I have run into many situations that centered around the serving of liquor on airlines. Many of these incidents involved me personally; others happened to stewardess friends of mine.

For example, after drinking too much before and during one recent flight, a man decided, with the plane at 15,000 feet, that he wanted to enter the cockpit. He was a friendly enough chap, but he simply wasn't allowed in the cockpit under the rules of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Now, he didn't get into the cockpit, but he created quite a disturbance, and one of the three-man crew had to come back into the passenger cabin to quiet him down.

In another case a rather elderly gentleman, not himself due to his indulging, decided that this would be the time and the place (at midnight, somewhere over Long Island Sound) to give someone a goodnight kiss. He leaned over the seat in front of him and kissed its occupant. Both she and he were married—but not to each other.

These incidents sometimes have their humorous side, but for the most part they

aren't funny. I personally have had passengers who, after drinking too much, have tampered with emergency exits (which can't be opened in flight, but which still should be left alone) and who have failed to observe "fasten seat belts" and "no smoking" signs.

On some airlines the more experienced stewardesses who have seniority to choose their flights often select trips on which liquor is not available.

There is definitely a safety aspect to this question. I believe, as do other members of the Air Line Stewards and Stewardess Association, that serving liquor in flight creates conditions under which incidents endangering the lives of passengers and crews could more readily occur. Passengers who imbibe bring a risk that is totally unnecessary.

I personally feel, however, that the greater disservice done to all concerned is the discomfort and annoyance to others brought about by such in-flight drinking.

While airlines have rules and regulations allowing them to refuse to admit to a flight one who obviously has been drinking too much, such detection is not always a simple matter. Then, too, the effect of altitude on a drinker can be an amazing one.

The way I understand it, the thing that makes one "drunk" is the numbing of reflexes and the slowing down of bodily functions, including breathing. This allows carbon dioxide to build up within the body, creating varying degrees of dizziness.

The condition is aggravated more in a high-flying airplane which, even though pressurized, allows the passenger slightly rarefied air and even less oxygen than he gets on the ground. Thus, one has a head start on intoxication when he is flying.

To put it another way, one drink in the air may be as potent as two on the ground.

PILOTS SHOULD NOT HAVE ADDED RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Clarence N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, International)

The interest of airline pilots in legislation to curtail or abolish the serving of alcoholic beverages on aircraft in flight stems from three areas of concern:

1. The compromise with safety introduced by liquor served to passengers.
2. The additional burden imposed upon pilots who must bear the responsibility for the safe and honorable conduct of passengers while operating aircraft safely.

3. The assumption of responsibility for the maintenance of order and harmony, as well as safe conduct, among passengers permitted to consume alcoholic beverages.

When an aircraft leaves the ground it contains people of diverse backgrounds, experience, and habits. Some may have overcome apprehension about flying and be completely relaxed. Others may be under considerable nervous tension. Some may have a capacity for a considerable amount of alcohol with no ill effect. Others may react suddenly to small quantities.

There is no way of knowing what the reaction of any individual passenger will be prior to the beginning of the flight.

One of the greatest fears of all pilots is fire in flight. The careless use of cigarettes or matches by an inebriated passenger could start even a small fire which could create panic.

An apprehensive passenger, relieved of inhibitions by alcohol, could attempt to enter the cockpit. If he succeeded, he would interfere with the operation of the aircraft by the flight crew or possibly tamper with delicate instruments necessary to safe flight. Should an emergency occur, it could be tragic if stewardess or pilot had to contend with passengers whose judgment and alertness were dimmed by alcohol.

Operating an aircraft is a full-time task for the flight crew. But there have been

instances where it has been necessary for the pilot to come out of the flight deck to subdue inebriated passengers. Had the pilot been injured, the flight would have been deprived of his services—and an emergency created.

Civil air regulations provide that a pilot shall not permit any person to be carried in an aircraft who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs, except a medical patient under proper care or in case of an emergency. This places the responsibility on the pilot to refuse passage to individuals under the influence of alcohol. And for many years, we have carried out this responsibility.

But who can tell about the person who has had a cocktail or two before boarding? The first drink a stewardess innocently serves him could start a chain reaction of trouble and embarrassment, not only for her but for other passengers who, for the flight, are his involuntary associates.

Our association is skeptical that the pilot can effectively carry out all of his responsibilities if additional problems, created by serving liquor, are added to them.

Many foreign airlines have always served liquor aboard. When U.S. airlines adopted the practice on domestic flights, our association called these problems to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Air Transport Association. We urged that the industry take voluntary action to terminate or regulate this practice. A competitive situation, we pointed out, was being created, under which airlines were being forced to serve liquor on board or to provide setups for people who brought their own.

The more than 15,000 members of the Air Line Pilots Association, International (AFL-CIO) have expressed concern for many years over the social, safety, and legal implications of airborne bars serving alcohol aloft. We strongly condemned it at our 13th convention in 1954. Subsequently, we asked Congress to act to regulate this problem after attempts at other methods of solving it failed.

We plan to continue to press for enactment of regulations which would provide a satisfactory solution.

Liquor policies of 12 major airlines in United States

	Started serving liquor	Daily flights	Flights with liquor	Maximum drinks allowed	Drink served free
American...	1953	1,000	60	2	Yes.
Brantiff.....	1956	134	14	2	Yes.
Capital.....	1957	300	87	2	No.
Continental..	1957	76	13	2	No.
Delta.....	1958	177	2	2	No.
Eastern.....	1954	477	112	2	No.
National.....	1950	48	10	2	No.
Northeast....	1957	150	14	2	No.
Northwest...					
Orient.....	1949	80	53	2	No.
Trans.....					
World.....	1952	180	60	2	Yes.
United.....	1955	140	14	2	No.
Western.....	1954	88	23	2	Yes.

¹ Wine only.

² Champagne only.

STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point a statement by the members of the House Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement by Members of the House Committee on Public Works:

The labored reasoning in denying the award of a turbine contract to an English firm on alleged national security grounds is one of the new highs in political irresponsibility exhibited by the Eisenhower administration.

The prostitution of the country's trade policy for political reasons is bad enough, but as strong supporters of the development of a sound and constructive national water policy, we fear that the action of the administration is a further effort to sabotage the development of this program.

As a result of the administration's action, the Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas will cost approximately \$300,000 more than necessary. This \$300,000 could be put to constructive use, for instance, to plan some of the vitally needed flood control installations in the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio that might have averted some of the millions of dollars of damage being suffered in those States today. At a time when the administration is choking off water resources development under the guise of economy, this action in regard to the Greer's Ferry Dam is indefensible.

What makes the finding of defense essentiality by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization more ridiculous is the fact that construction on the Greer's Ferry Dam would never have started if Congress had not written in an appropriation in 1957 over the objections of the Bureau of the Budget. Just 2 years ago the Eisenhower Administration told the Congress that this project was not worth constructing. Now it is telling the American people and our allies abroad that it is essential to our defense that the turbines in the dam not be built abroad regardless of the extra cost involved.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, FRANK E. SMITH, T. A. THOMPSON, JIM WRIGHT, JOHN J. McFALL, DENVER D. HARGIS, ROBERT E. COOK, W. R. HULL, JR., Members of Congress.

THE IMMORTAL VICTOR HERBERT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 1, marks the 100th anniversary of the beloved American composer and great American, Victor Herbert. It is my understanding that the occasion will be appropriately celebrated by proclamations of mayors of principal cities, nationwide television and radio shows, articles in newspapers throughout the country, and other fitting observances. I desire to bring to the attention of the House on his great birthday the cherished significance of the life, brilliant career, and memorable contributions of this great American.

Victor Herbert was not only one of the most loved creators of musical works ever to appear on the American scene—he was also fittingly a courageous champion of the rights of his fellow composers to a just return for the public performance for profit of their compositions. Too often we tend to forget that the product of a creator's heart

and brain, when made public in the form of a copyrighted work, belongs to the creator and is just as much his property as his house or his automobile. Use of his property for profit by others is deserving of compensation.

I am proud to say that in the United States of America, under our free-enterprise system, in general we respect composers' property rights, and that the U.S. Constitution guarantees every creator protection for his works over a term of years. The majority of the Nation's talented writers of music receive fees from the public performance of their compositions through the oldest and best known performing right society, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, which Victor Herbert founded in 1914, with the help of John Philip Sousa and other of his eminent contemporaries so very dear to the hearts of the American people.

Born in Dublin, Herbert journeyed to Germany as a small boy and there received his musical education. When he was 15, he chose music as his vocation and the cello as his solo instrument. It was as a cellist that he met his wife, the celebrated German soprano, Therese Foerster, and was hired by the Metropolitan Opera to come to the United States with her in 1886.

Herbert was not long in this country before he began establishing a reputation on his own—first as a cellist with some of our leading orchestras, then as an assistant conductor. For 4 years he was leader of the 22d Regiment Band before accepting a post as conductor of the Pittsburgh Symphony.

His years in Pittsburgh brought the orchestra there new stature and enhanced his own reputation as a musical interpreter. By 1904 he had established his own orchestra, which he led for many years in concerts in New York and other cities.

Leading his orchestra, Herbert became an important early recording artist for the Edison and Victor Cos. He was the first to function as an A. & R. man for the Edison organization.

Throughout this period of development in the performance of music, Herbert was composing a variety of musical works—a list that eventually included not only some of the most popular melodies of the 20th century, but more than 40 operettas, 2 grand operas, orchestral suites, chamber pieces, choral works, and recital pieces for piano, violin, cello, or the voice.

In 1916 he became the first man to compose an American musical score for a full-length motion picture, "The Fall of a Nation." He was working on an orchestral film overture at the time of his death.

As I have stated, Herbert was a leader in helping his fellow composers. Aware for some years that European copyright laws guaranteed a composer the right to payments whenever his works were performed for profit, he became a leader in this country in the fight to protect musical property from unauthorized use. In 1914, largely through his efforts, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers was formed, and

Herbert served as a director and vice president until his death 10 years later.

The amazing diversity of Victor Herbert's music accomplishments is little known largely because he is so very well known as the creator of some of the Nation's most popular melodies. Today, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, and 35 years after his death, he remains one of the most listened-to composers of all time. For scarcely an hour goes by without the performance of an immortal Herbert tune, somewhere: "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," "March of the Toys," "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life," "A Kiss in the Dark," "Indian Summer," "Sweethearts." Without surrendering his professional standards, Herbert had above all the gift of writing music that would capture the sentiments—as well as the ears—of a great song-loving public.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of some repetition, to elaborate on some major, but by no means all, great achievements in Victor Herbert's astonishingly brilliant musical and public career. I regret not to be able in the time available to me to cover more of the personal life, famous works, and public as well as musical interests and accomplishments.

There is no danger that Victor Herbert's best melodies will be forgotten by the American people. But there is always danger that Victor Herbert's full significance will fail to be realized at its true worth. As man and musician he rendered inestimable service to his adopted country, and our musical development would be far different from what it is had this genial Irishman not been among us.

Victor was born in Dublin on February 1, 1859, the grandson of Samuel Lover, celebrated Irish author, artist and songwriter, and son of Fanny Lover Herbert whose intense and sensitive nature was transmitted to her offspring. Edward Herbert, the boy's father, died when Victor was still a young child, and his widow was immediately concerned about the boy's training and education. It was fortunate that she married again, to a German physician practicing in Stuttgart, Germany. Here Victor grew to young manhood, studying the classics and developing his musical abilities which had revealed themselves when he was still a stripling. His chosen instrument was the violoncello, which he completely mastered, but he also studied composition and was on his way to success as a classical composer long before he ever dreamed of leaving Europe. His early songs, pieces, and suites reveal that rich vein of melody which later made him America's favorite theatrical composer.

Playing in the Stuttgart Court Orchestra he met Therese Foerster, leading soprano of the court opera, and wooed her while acting as her coach and accompanist. When she was offered a contract by the Metropolitan Opera Co. in New York she refused to come unless Victor, her new husband, came too. Consequently, in the early fall of 1886 young Mr. and Mrs. Herbert debarked in New York, full of anticipation for the future which

would be as surprising as it was unpredictable.

Herbert immediately established himself as a man of energy, ambition, and independence. He was not long satisfied in being one of the cellists in the Metropolitan Orchestra. He quickly established himself as a teacher, he played in other ensembles, he became a leading spirit in the promotion of chamber music—then tragically rare in New York—he was a conducting protege of Anton Seidl, and he made his influence felt far and wide. No small part of this influence stemmed from the fact that he was the leading cello virtuoso of the day, the peer of any artist in Europe, and certainly the finest in the Western Hemisphere.

A man with Herbert's boundless energy, unique capacity for friendship, and highly developed technical skill could not long remain satisfied with any one job or activity. In 1893 he became the director of Gilmore's Band—officially known as the 22d Regiment Band of the New York National Guard. Herbert was intent upon bringing music and people together, and the band offered him an excellent opportunity. He quickly restored the band to its former prestige and made it the best organization of its kind in America. Its selection for and success in playing at the inauguration of President McKinley in 1897 emphasized the excellence that Herbert brought to this aspect of musicmaking.

Band directing, however, is still not the same thing as symphonic conducting. When the conductorship of the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra fell vacant in 1898, Herbert was the successful candidate for the position, and for 6 years he distinguished himself as the director of a major symphony orchestra. Not only did he present excellent concerts in the steel city, but he closely rivaled Theodore Thomas in taking symphonic music to scores of communities eager for new artistic experiences. And in so doing he made his remarkable personality known to an ever-widening circle of friends and admirers.

But above all things Herbert was a composer. He possessed the vein of melody already referred to, and he had the skill to dress this melody in sumptuous romantic harmony and sparkling instrumentation. Realizing that the severities of the concert hall left little scope for bringing his music to the people he experimented in 1894 with an operetta, "Prince Ananias," the first of an incredible number of stage productions. While only reasonably successful it initiated his career as an operetta composer which has yet to be surpassed in terms of beauty, artistry, and long range popularity. His first stage masterpiece was the operetta entitled "The Serenade"—1897, followed quickly by two more splendid works, "The Fortune Teller"—1898, and "The Singing Girl"—1899. These productions made clear that a new and powerful musical force was making itself felt in America, and the critics hailed Herbert as the equal of the operetta masters of Europe.

Herbert's deserved success was not unnoticed by jealous enemies. Attacked

and slandered in the pages of the old Musical Courier, Herbert fought back and vindicated himself in a way which benefited all composers subjected to similar ill treatment. When the courtroom battle was ended Herbert resumed his creative career, comfortably aware that he had vanquished the viciousness of tawdry journalism.

Early in the 20th century Herbert began to produce a bewildering series of operettas which confirmed the impression of earlier years. As he wrote score after score it was impossible that they all be equally meritorious; he wrote too fast for that. Fortunately we measure a great man's work by the best he achieves, not by his failures or indifferent successes.

The first great triumph of the new century was "Babes in Toyland," produced in 1903 and still a perennial favorite of the American people. What would musical Christmas today be without "The March of the Toys"? In 1905 "Mademoiselle Modiste" took the country by storm and Fritzi Scheff became Herbert's leading interpreter. This show was sprightly and sparkling, and the languorous "Kiss Me Again" has never lost its persuasive appeal. In 1906 "The Red Mill" began to exert its enchantment; and, after several less popular works, in 1910, "Naughty Marietta" brought new delight to a national audience. Perhaps the most beautiful of all American operettas, this work remains a high point of America's musical theater. It was richly scored, dramatic in concept and treatment, lavishly colorful, and highly imaginative. The mention of only a few of its excerpts brings fond and precious memories to mind: "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp," "Neath the Southern Moon," "I'm Falling in Love With Someone," "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life." After this superb score, Herbert's subsequent masterpieces included "The Enchantress," 1911; "Sweethearts," 1913; "The Only Girl," 1914; "The Princess Pat," 1915; and "Eileen," 1917. Interspersed among these and following them were additional ambitious operettas which were almost, if not quite, their equal, the last one deserving special mention being "Orange Blossoms," 1922, with his last immortal melody, "A Kiss in the Dark."

It must be admitted that as Herbert grew older the style of American operetta was changing. The influence of ragtime and noisier, more raucous utterances were in the ascendancy. Herbert's spaciousness and dignity and Old World charm were not as much sought after as they had been. The beauty of his music was identified with a period, and the people who welcomed the newer styles had little patience with what the old master could offer. But the power of this old master resides in the fact that the music of his operettas, if not the productions themselves, is as eloquent today as ever.

Even this brief survey of Herbert's operetta career fails to cover his contribution to American music. He made two important attempts at grand opera. The first was "Natoma"—1911—an ambitious opera based upon the Spanish-

Indian life of southern California early in the 19th century. When produced by the Chicago Opera Co. the leading singers were Mary Garden and John McCormack. It remained in the repertoire for 3 years and focused the attention of the country upon the problems of the American opera composer. While not permanently successful, its many pages of excellent music and its chronological importance keep it a landmark in the development of American musical drama. Herbert's second grand opera was "Madeleine"—1914—which was produced by the Metropolitan Opera Co. This was a one-act incident in the life of a French opera singer of the 18th century. Peculiarly enough Herbert here endeavored to write in a style which was neither natural to him nor appreciated by lovers of Italian bel canto. Its revival, if a suitable occasion could be found, would be interesting and worthwhile.

Important as Victor Herbert was as a composer his services to American music went much further. It should always be remembered that Herbert thought in terms of aiding his colleagues. He wanted composers to receive their just due; he wanted them to have a fair return for their efforts; he opposed the attempts of manufacturers and managers and proprietors to make money from music while the composer remained unpaid. The first opportunity for service in this direction came to Herbert in the early years of this century preceding the adoption of the copyright law of 1909. Campaigning vigorously and tirelessly Herbert, the composers' chief representative, succeeded in obtaining the clause giving musical creators a share in the royalties of phonograph recordings. The amount seemed small, only 2 cents a side, but it was more than the manufacturers wished to pay.

Without Herbert's great efforts in the struggle the composers might have gained nothing. It is also significant to note here that Herbert himself made no phonograph records until after his triumph was won. With the victory assured he and his celebrated concert orchestra began issuing a series of records which became enormously popular, first for Edison and later for Victor.

The next great opportunity for Herbert to serve his fellow composers occurred with the establishment of ASCAP—American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—in 1913 and 1914. Although the copyright law extended certain exclusive rights to composers it provided no means for enforcement, and a concerted effort had to be made before the full effect of the law could materialize. Herbert and eight enlightened colleagues determined to found a society which would represent the composers struggling to obtain earnings which were—and are—rightfully theirs. Every composer of the present day who profits from performance of his music owes an enormous debt of gratitude to Herbert, the chief and most influential founder of ASCAP.

This triumph was not easily won. Proprietors who used music in their halls

and restaurants were opposed to giving the composer a share of their profit. It took 3 years of litigation and finally the august Supreme Court of the United States, with Herbert always the key figure in the picture, to place American composers within reach of security and economic independence. Not that they became wealthy overnight—but they achieved a firm position of bargaining power and they found a means of asserting ownership of their own products which was impossible previously. And this they owed to Victor Herbert, the champion of composers' rights.

When Herbert died in New York on May 26, 1924, America lost one of her greatest sons. In addition to his innumerable triumphs as composer and artist he had made a host of friends who loved him dearly, and why not? He was one of the most lovable of men, jovial in his sociability, princely in his generosity, deeply sincere in his relations and activities. He brought happiness to the American people and he added a new meaning to musical integrity. He was enormously productive and he participated in many forms of musicmaking. His death was the occasion for front page headlines in practically every newspaper of the United States. In his passing the country seemed to realize that it had lost a great man, as indeed it had. A friend of Herbert's and one of the cofounders of ASCAP, Raymond Hubbell, remarked that the death of Herbert was like the disappearance of the sun. He was not the only one that felt this way, but the sun had only seemed to set. Its rays shine on in the warmth of Herbert's music, and his personality will be with us as long as we have the sensitivity to respond to his art and quicken to his name.

I fear it is hardly possible with these feeble words to appraise adequately the work and influence of the noble, gifted Irish-American, Victor Herbert. Passionate lover of and fighter for personal liberty and self-determination, composer of songs of inspiration, courage, and love, warm and loyal in his friendships, vital and vigorous in his work for many fine causes, sympathetic, robust, and warmhearted, few men in his own field have left deeper impress upon his times. Throughout recorded time his immortal melodies will ring down the unbroken channels of history, bringing sweetness, brightness, inspiration, and love to myriads yet unborn. The strains of "Thine Alone," and its kindred will live forever in the hearts of the people. The memory of Victor Herbert will live forever. May he continue to inspire us.

I am much indebted and very thankful to my friend, the distinguished author and writer and learned biographer of Victor Herbert, Dr. Edward W. Waters, for his valued advice and assistance.

SIMPLE SOLUTION FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I come from a depressed area down in southeastern Kentucky.

In September of last year the percentage of unemployed in the Middleboro-Harlan area of my district was 16.2 percent. And in that same month the percentage of unemployed in the Corbin area down in my district at the junction of three counties was 12.8 percent.

Many House and Senate Members have these same unemployment problems in their own districts extending from California to the Carolinas and from Michigan down to Mississippi. Many of these depressed area Members have seen their unemployed people line up at the county courthouses to receive Government commodities and then carry them away in burlap bags on their backs for sustenance of their families in many humble homes throughout the land where these human pockets of under-privilege exist here in our great Nation.

Various other parts of the country are now enjoying a very pleasing prosperity at the exact time when depression area citizens are groping hopelessly amid the encircling gloom of substantial unemployment and real need. These conditions should not exist and both the Congress and the White House should be much concerned toward dissolving area depression and at the same time promoting prosperity in a more even consistency across the entire face of our land.

Quite a few remedies have been offered, but most of them involve, first, expenditure of much money; second, setting up of another Government bureaucracy; third, general procrastination; fourth, some untried experimentation; or, fifth, pulling of industry out of one place and putting it into another place.

My bill, H.R. 3696, just introduced, is a simple but effective approach to this entire problem.

My bill gives during a limited time a Federal income tax exemption as an incentive to any industry that is willing to open its doors and operate in a depression area while, first, employing an average of 200 persons; second, refraining from taking employment from one place to locate it in another place; and third, establishing itself where unemployment has been 10 percent or more for at least 6 months before the taxable year of claimed exemption.

My bill does not put more tax on anybody. My bill does not set up any added bureaucracy. My bill becomes effective now, when enacted, not next year. My bill follows the tried, proven path of tax exemption incentive, already shown to be effective in a Federal program of fast tax chargeoffs that caused numerous big companies to spend millions for plant expansion in these recent years. My bill does not take employees from one spot to put them in another spot, in other words, does not rob Peter to pay Paul.

My entire approach is so simple you are apt to look on it with some suspicion, but I hope your minds will be open to it.

My colleagues from unemployment areas, please study my bill and if you agree with me that it has some good possibility for solving one of the country's greatest problems of today, make this bill yours and help me dissolve depression and promote prosperity for the people of your own part of the Nation.

THE REVOLUTION IN MARITIME CARGO HANDLING

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, Government has an enormous stake, both financial and regulatory, in the various segments of our transportation industry. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance, in my opinion, that the Congress and the executive branch take an active interest in a new form of freight handling that links land and water transport into a single, integrated system.

This newly developing system can best be described as containerization. Already, because of its startling innovations, it is being hailed by experts as a revolution in transportation.

Now, it so happens that the first main utilization of containerization came in the port of Seattle, an area I have the privilege of representing. I, therefore, have had some opportunity to become acquainted firsthand with this new system of freight handling. To say the least, I am impressed by the tremendous potential benefits it offers to everyone who ships by a combination of land and water carriers. At the same time, I am seriously concerned by the many difficult problems which are bound to arise as this system evolves to maturity.

The nature of containerization is such that it encompasses the maritime industry, the railroads, and truckers. Traditionally, these are competing elements of our transport system. Now they have an opportunity, in serving the public interest, to coordinate their efforts to the end that a maximum load of merchandise can be started on its way at some inland point and, without reloading, be delivered on some far-distant shore or inland destination.

The full development of this new system confronts management and unions in all sections of the transportation industry with a wide range of challenging problems. More than that, Government is bound to be affected, as traditional patterns in freight handling by truckers, railroads and the merchant marine are drastically altered. To give meaning to these conclusions, and in the hope of provoking more concern both by the Congress and the executive branch with containerization, I would like to outline briefly some of the main features and problems that have come to my attention.

The idea of simplifying the task of transporting many small items by placing them in a container is not a new one.

Its history is almost as old as civilization. As one writer on this subject recently said, Noah's ark was a primitive form of container. What is presently new in this idea is the use of a single container to be transported by a combination of land and ocean carriers direct from shipper to purchaser. This system, now known as "unitization" or "containerization," makes use of boxlike devices of varying capacity in which are packed an indefinite number of items whose only common characteristic may be a single destination.

Alaska Steamship Co., a line serving Seattle and Alaskan ports, was a pioneer in adapting the principle of containerization to oceangoing vessels. As far back as 1949 this company began experimenting with the use of simple wooden containers, called "cribs," in which merchandise was packed for delivery from shipper to consignee. The next major step came in 1953, when Alaska Steam made an arrangement with a truckline operator to provide for the use of vans in a combined one-rate through service to Alaskan interior points on a door-to-door imported basis.

The new system proved so successful that by November of 1958, Alaska Steam announced an enlarged van program. It called for modification of 3 ships, at considerable capital expenditure, to increase carrying capacity from 39 to 82 vans. The announcement went on to say: "Ocean, highway, and rail carriers here have combined to provide one of the first integrated services in the United States."

At present, the Alaska Steamship Co. provides through van service from shipper to consignee for southeastern and southwestern Alaska, including Kodiak Island. Vans for Anchorage and Fairbanks, moving by Alaska liners from Seattle, are handled piggyback on the Alaska Railroad from the port of Seward. At destination, delivery is made by Garrison Fast Freight or Alaska Railroad.

Alaska Steamship's success with containerization served to give impetus to similar operations by other water carriers. For example, Matson Navigation Co., a major west coast line serving Hawaii, has undertaken a long-range program which already has involved the conversion of 6 of their 15 C-3 freighters at an estimated cost of between \$5 million and \$6 million. Currently, they are handling containers on these freighters only on deck, but the company plans further conversion to permit handling the containers in the hold. One deck-van ship sails from San Francisco each week and another from Los Angeles. The six ships are estimated to provide something more than 100,000 measurement tons of van capacity per year.

On the east coast the outstanding container program is that of the Pan Atlantic Steamship Corp. Loading at the New York end takes place at Port Newark, N.J. I am informed that a ship can be loaded and discharged in 13 hours, compared to the usual 84 hours for a ship of similar size loaded and discharged in the conventional fashion.

Forty-two longshoremen are needed, compared to 126 men for traditional operations. The loading cost for a specific ship, as reported in the New York Times of November 23, 1958, was \$1,528.80, or about one-twentieth of the \$29,635.20 cost of loading and discharging a comparable ship by conventional means. The New York Times article describes the operation as follows:

The trailers are loaded at shippers' plants throughout the country and hauled over the road by commercial trucklines to the parking lot of a Pan Atlantic terminal. There, longshore drivers take over and shift the trailer to shipside following carefully drawn loading plans.

Once alongside, dockers open the clamps holding the trailer body to the chassis. Then, one of the ship's cranes grasps the body, hoists it aboard, lowers it into the hold, picks up an inbound trailer body, lifts it out of the hold, and lowers it to the waiting chassis. The pier workers fasten the clamps and the truck moves back to the parking lot where teamsters will pick it up for delivery to its destination.

Many other operations, utilizing varying forms of the container principle, such as lift-on lift-off vans, roll-on roll-off trucks, or boxlike devices, are rapidly developing in all sections of the maritime industry. The important point is that a tremendous and exciting transformation in handling cargo that moves by land and water is in full swing.

Some of the advantages of the new system have already been indicated in the reference to the Pan Atlantic operation. A more rounded picture of the benefits can easily be seen in the following quotation from the New York Times of last October 17:

A trailer is loaded, for example, in Springfield, Mo. It travels by road to New York or San Francisco, sealed, virtually damage-proof and theftproof. By ship it goes to France or to Japan, eliminating warehousing, stacking, and sorting. Each ship takes on her cargo with a few hundred lifts, compared to 5,000 individual lifts by the old method.

From this graphic description a number of points are self-evident. Cargo loss claims are reduced to a minimum. Merchandise arrives clean and intact. Cargo handling costs at shipside, one of the main cost items, are substantially reduced. Most important, ship turnaround time in port, a major factor in freight rates, is trimmed to a fraction of that required under a conventional loading system.

From these few highlights it is clear that the full development of the containerization system represents a tremendous potential in promoting the full flow of commerce. Yet, it must also be recognized that containerization projects many knotty and troublesome problems.

Of great consequence, is the question of how the workers involved in this technological transformation—longshoremen, truckers, and others—will react. Certainly they are confronted by many difficult decisions. They face the unpleasant prospect of gradual loss of thousands of jobs. It is likewise clear that the demand may be made upon them for drastic revision of many his-

toric working practices and conditions. These two considerations alone suggest a human problem of tremendous magnitude and one that is packed with explosive force.

Another labor issue is the danger of jurisdictional disputes as new operations bring about new work patterns. For example, and I refer to the description of the Pan Atlantic operation, who is to drive the trailer from terminal to shipside—teamster or longshoreman? Or, to select another possibility, who will handle the assembly of cargo into vans or other containers when it is performed at terminals close to the waterfront? Or, who is to operate and service the new equipment that will be required on the waterfront to handle vans and other large containers? Already, there are indications of competition for what looks like a shrinking number of jobs.

Many other technical problems are coming to the surface as containerization proceeds. For example, there is the question of standardizing vans and containers. At the moment, each carrier seems to be working up its own container without much reference to what other companies are doing. Matson vans are not the same as Alaska Steamship vans, and both are different from those used by Pan Atlantic. The railroads, which have been handling vans piggyback for much longer than the steamship companies, have their own specially designed containers.

In the regulatory field, freight rates are likely to be affected. For example, I am advised that Matson and Alaska Steam have filed special tariffs for cargo handled in vans. Already there has been one protest appearing in the papers and no doubt there are many others. James M. Hanley, president of the Rice Products Co., Inc., of San Francisco, asked the California Public Utilities Commission to investigate container freight rates. Apparently he is complaining that Matson Navigation Co. and Hawaiian Textron are giving special rates to some of his competitors. If the use of containers is at the discretion of the carrier, and carrier rates are less than rates for conventional haulage, it is obvious that discrimination may develop.

These problems, none of which appear susceptible to easy solution, have led me, as a member of the House Merchant Marine Committee, to conclude that the time is ripe for some sort of helping hand from Government. My conclusion has been reinforced by a recent discussion I had with Mr. Paul St. Sure, head of the Pacific Maritime Association, a west coast management group. In particular, Mr. St. Sure pointed to the difficult task of reconciling new operations with the established work force on the waterfront.

As I understand it, labor and management on east and west coasts are now negotiating over the issues raised by containerization. However, these negotiations are taking place separately and are likely to produce conflicting results. One unfortunate possibility, an old bugaboo of the merchant marine, is a succession of regional whipsawing, as unions

or sections of management struggle for position. Another development, as indicated previously, is conflict over jurisdiction. Or, at the very least, it can be anticipated that a great deal of friction and confusion, even work stoppages, is in the offing.

The labor problem, taken together with other aspects of containerization, suggests to me that the public interest calls for some constructive assistance from Government. I am not one lightly to urge Government intervention, but there appears to be a compelling need for all elements in the transport industry affected by containerization to be brought together for common discussion and consultation. Possibly some guidelines, indicative of a national approach, can be agreed upon. Possibly a climate conducive to mature collective bargaining, as well as settlement of technical problems, can be promoted. Certainly it appears that here is a challenge for the appropriate executive agency.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, it is most fortunate that the newly appointed Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Honorable John J. Allen, Jr., is a man with broad background in the merchant marine. For many years he served with distinction on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member. I am confident Mr. Allen already has considerable knowledge on the subject of containerization, and is, therefore, well fitted to provide the necessary leadership in helping the various elements of the transportation industry to solve their problems.

I am aware that already much has been done by various agencies in the field of containerization. But I am convinced there has been hesitancy in tackling some of the practical problems I have indicated. I also feel, on the basis of my information, that there has been regrettable delay in recognizing the enormous implications for the public interest in the development of containerization. I trust and hope that the Department of Commerce, as well as other agencies, will speedily give weight to my opinions.

I likewise urge that my colleagues in the House give this subject earnest consideration in the future. In due course the Congress is bound to feel the impact of this rapidly evolving transportation system that makes the most efficient use of land and water carriers.

Mr. Speaker, in the past the very able chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has rendered great service to the American shipping industry by seeking information in the field of maritime practices. I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] will be helpful if it appears that congressional action is needed.

Meanwhile, it is interesting to note that representatives of various segments of the shipping industry meeting in New York City recently seemed in agreement that use of giant containers could revolutionize shipping and even ships. Their decisions indicate it could mean the very survival of the American merchant marine.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone here is quite cognizant of the fact that labor legislation in this session of Congress is almost a must. I know that each and every Member has his own ideas about the type of legislation he would like to see enacted in this body.

There will probably be two major bills, perhaps three major bills, but I should like each Member of Congress, regardless of his party or his philosophy, to study these bills personally, to weigh them carefully, and then it is my hope that the Committee on Labor of the House and the Labor Committee in the other body will be able to bring to the floor of each body the kind of legislation that will benefit all the people of this country and will provide labor and management a fair solution of the problems that exist today.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that corruption and racketeering be kept out of labor-management relations. There is one proposal which would do this effectively without crippling labor or management. I am referring to the proposal which would carry out the recommendations contained in the President's labor message.

Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to shocking revelations by the investigations of the congressional committees into improper activities on the part of both labor and management. We have seen what can happen when employers and union officials who are supposed to be dealing at arm's length put their personal gain above the interests they represent.

Our whole legal system guaranteeing the rights of individual workers and safeguarding the public interest in the exercise of these rights is made a mockery when these individuals enter into collusion.

It is high time that we did something about this situation. None of us should countenance any delay, for the longer we delay action, the more flagrant the abuses will become.

The administration has provided us with the pattern of legislation that will eradicate the evils which have sprung up in labor relations. Union officials will think twice before they use union funds for personal convenience if they know that a full report of their actions will be available to each and every union member. Employers will pause before they attempt to undermine a union officer's obligations to union members by under-the-table bribes, if they realize that such transactions will be spread on the record for all to see.

The administration's proposals would require full reporting and disclosure of the activities of unions, union officials, employers, and labor consultants.

I strongly recommend that they be approved by Congress without delay.

EXPLANATION OF BILL FOR THE ENACTMENT OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ACT OF 1959

This bill is designed to provide needed safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations. It would require the reporting and disclosure of the financial operations and administrative practices of labor organizations, certain financial transactions of their officers, and direct and indirect dealings between officers of such organizations and employers which may involve conflicts of interests. The bill, in general, would reinforce rights of members with respect to the proper administration and application of the funds and property of labor organizations, the election and removal of officers, and protect subordinate organizations and their members from abuses of the devices used to exercise supervisory control over their affairs. In addition, the bill provides certain needed adjustments in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which will better protect certain employees, the public, and innocent third parties from the consequences of labor disputes, as well as provide improvements in representation procedures with respect to the construction industry to more adequately meet the needs of labor-management relations in that industry.

As recommended by the President:

All unions would be required to file annual reports with the Department of Labor with respect to their financial operations and to furnish such information to their members. In addition, unions would be required to file copies of their constitutions and bylaws along with detailed information with respect to their organization and procedures, including certification that prescribed minimum standards for the election and removal of officers are provided and being followed.

Information required to be reported under the act would be open to the public, and unions would be required to keep adequate records on matters to be reported which would be open to examination by Government representatives and, upon request, accessible to union members.

Unions, union officers and agents, and employers would be required to report and keep records regarding any payments or transactions, including those engaged in through employer intermediaries, which may create conflicts of interests or involve interference with the statutory collective bargaining and organizational rights of employees.

Union funds and property would be required to be held and administered for the benefit of the members and for furthering the purposes of the union and such duty would be enforceable in any court in a suit by, or in behalf of, its members.

All unions would be required to hold periodic elections of officers and to observe minimum standards for the conduct of elections, including the right of all members to vote, with due notice, by

secret ballot without restraint or coercion, equal opportunity for all members to nominate and be candidates, and the provision of procedures and facilities to insure honest elections and the accurate tabulation of votes; the use of union or employer funds to promote any candidate for union office would be banned and union constitutions and bylaws would have to contain detailed statements of election procedures and compliance with such procedures would be required to be certified to by the principal executive officer.

All unions would be required to observe minimum standards, including conformity with applicable provisions of their constitutions and bylaws, in the exercise of supervisory control over the affairs of subordinate bodies, the exercise of such control to be limited to purposes of insuring democratic, honest, and responsible administration of the subordinate body and effectuating legitimate objectives of the labor organization.

The administration of this legislation would be placed in the Secretary of Labor and he would be provided with adequate authority to issue regulations, investigate, subpoena witnesses and documents, hold hearings, issue decisions and orders—which would be subject to judicial review—requiring compliance and imposing sanctions for willful violations, and bring actions in the Federal courts for injunctions to compel compliance with the act.

The bill would provide criminal penalties or administrative sanctions of loss of tax exemption or the use of or access to procedures under Federal labor-management relations statutes for willful violations of the act; it would also prescribe criminal penalties for concealment or destruction of records required by the act to be kept, bribery between employers and employee representatives, embezzlement of union or certain trust funds, and false entry or destruction of union books and records.

Any present remedies that union members have under State or Federal laws, in addition to those provided in the bill, would be preserved.

The secondary boycott provisions of the National Labor Relations Act would be strengthened and extended so as to cover direct coercion of secondary employers and inducements of individual employees to refuse to perform services with an object of forcing their employer to cease doing business with another person, and to include employers not otherwise covered by the act under the protections of the provisions; it would also be made clear that union activity is permitted against secondary employers performing "farmed out" struck work for the primary employer and, under certain circumstances, against secondary employers engaged in work at a common construction site with the primary employer.

It would be made an unfair labor practice, subject to mandatory injunction, for a union to picket in order to coerce an employer to recognize it as bargaining representative of his employees or such employees to accept or

designate it where the employer has recognized another union in accordance with law; a representation election has been conducted within the preceding 12 months; it cannot be shown that there is a sufficient showing of interest on the part of the employees to be represented by such union; or picketing has continued for a long period of time without a representation election.

The National Labor Relations Board would be authorized to decline to assert jurisdiction over cases where it considers the effect on commerce is not substantial enough to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction and State courts and agencies would be permitted to exercise jurisdiction over these cases.

The provision of the National Labor Relations Act which bars certain strikers from voting in a representation election, although their replacements may vote, would be eliminated and the voting eligibility of strikers, as well as others, would be left to the administration discretion of the Board; the Board also would be permitted to conduct representation elections without prior hearings where there is no substantial objection to such an election.

The Board would be authorized to certify building and construction trades unions as bargaining representatives without an election, under carefully considered specific conditions.

Employers, as well as unions, wishing to use the Board's procedures would be required to sign non-Communist affidavits, thus equalizing the burden of such affidavits; this requirement would be strengthened by providing that an affidavit found by a court to be false shall not constitute compliance and requiring that the affidavit relate to conduct during the 12-month period preceding its execution.

It would be made clear that parties to a valid collective bargaining agreement need not bargain during the life of the agreement unless they have provided for a reopening, or such reopening is mutually agreeable.

It would be required that the Board be bipartisan in composition by providing that no more than three members may be of the same political party and the President would be authorized to designate an acting General Counsel of the Board when vacancies occur in that office.

A summary discussion of the bill by title and section follows:

Section 1 of the bill provides a short title for the legislation, the "Labor-Management Practices Act of 1959."

Section 2 consists of the congressional findings and policy showing the relationship of the subject matter to the free flow of commerce and the national public interest in the activities of labor organizations and the employees they represent.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS DEFINITIONS

Section 101: This section defines 14 terms used throughout the act, including "labor organization," "employer," "employee," "person," "commerce," "affecting commerce," and "supervisory control."

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Section 102: This section provides that if any provision of the act is held to be invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 103: The act becomes effective 60 days after the date of enactment, except that provisions authorizing the promulgation of regulations become effective immediately.

TITLE II—REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Section 201: This section obliges every person required to file reports or other documents with the Secretary of Labor under the act to file them in the manner required thereby, to maintain records necessary to explain and verify them, and to keep such records available for examination by the Secretary or his representative for at least 5 years.

REPORTING BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 202: This section requires every labor organization to file with the Secretary a copy of its constitution and bylaws and other basic documents along with a report, signed by its president—or other chief executive officer—and its secretary—or other chief records officer—containing detailed information, or references to the provisions of the governing documents containing such information, with respect to its major internal structure and procedures, including provisions for discipline or removal of officers or agents for breach of trust and provisions made for notice, hearings, judgment on the evidence and appeal procedure in connection with disciplinary action against members. Any changes in the reported information must be shown by an amendment filed when the next annual financial report is due.

Each labor organization must also certify annually that its constitution and bylaws contain the provisions for election and removal of officers required under title III, but a period of 2 years or until the next constitutional convention—whichever is earlier—is allowed to enable unions to incorporate such provisions in their constitution and bylaws if they certify during this interim period as to their existing provisions and procedures.

In addition, every labor organization exercising or assuming supervisory control over a subordinate labor organization must make, within 30 days of such assumption or at the time of filing the report required by this section and semi-annually thereafter, a report certifying that the requirements of title III are being observed and showing the union under control, the date control was established, the reason for the control and its duration, the steps being taken to reestablish autonomy, and specified information respecting voting rights of members and finances of the supervised body.

Section 203: Every labor organization must also file with the Secretary an annual report with respect to its financial affairs and indicating the method by which this report is made available to its members. These reports must show,

among other things, the assets and liabilities of the organization at the beginning and close of its last fiscal year and amounts paid as compensation and expense or other allowances for each officer, agent, and employee whose aggregate compensation and allowances for the year exceeded \$10,000. They must also explain in detail, or by reference to other reports, all receipts by the organization of any of its officers or agents of anything of value other than payments allowed under section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, from an employer having employees who are, or might be, represented by the labor organization, or from any person representing such an employer.

Section 204: This section requires every labor organization to make the information contained in its reports, and the records and data required to be kept, available to its members in the manner prescribed by the Secretary.

REPORTS OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT FINANCIAL DEALINGS

Section 205: This section requires every officer, agent or other representative of a labor organization to file reports with the Secretary with respect to all direct and indirect payments to or from employers having employees who are or might be organized or represented by the union or to or from persons representing any such employers—including transactions engaged in by a spouse or minor child. Also requires information on investments and business transactions so related to such an employer as to possibly involve conflicts of interest. If the officer, agent, or representative of the union derives direct or indirect benefit from any such transaction it must be reported even if the direct participant was some relative or other third person rather than the union officer himself. Payments allowable under section 302(c) of the LMRA, regular remuneration for service as an employee, purchases and sales in regular course of business at regular prices, and bona fide investments in traded securities not involving substantial interest need not be reported.

Section 206: Any employer who participated directly or indirectly in any transaction required to be reported by unions or their officers, agents or representatives under sections 203 or 205, or who paid employees or others for the performance of any acts whereby employees may be restrained, coerced or interfered with in the exercise of rights secured by section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act or by the Railway Labor Act, must file a report with the Secretary. These reports will identify the persons, including intermediaries, involved in the transaction, explain the circumstances of the transaction, and specify the sums, property, or benefit involved.

REGULATIONS OR REPORTS, RECORDS, AND DISCLOSURE OF REPORTED INFORMATION

Section 207: This section requires that reports be filed within 90 days after the effective date of the act or the establishment of the reporting organization, and annually thereafter as prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 208: This section authorizes the Secretary to prescribe such standards for required reports, recordkeeping, and disclosure of information, as may be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of the act's provisions.

Section 209: The contents of reports and documents filed with the Secretary are made public information, and he is authorized to publish and use such information for statistical and research purposes. He is also authorized to prescribe regulations providing for the examination by the public of the information contained in the reports and documents, and to furnish copies of the documents filed with him upon payment of the cost of the service. Copies of reports required to be filed will be made available by the Secretary, or by the reporting person, to appropriate State agencies.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS AMENDED

Section 210: This section amends sections 9 (f) and (g) of the National Labor Relations Act to substitute compliance with the filing requirements of this act for the present requirements of these subsections. This compliance is made a prerequisite to use of the NLRB facilities by both labor organizations and employers.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Section 211: Provides that union and company officers required to sign reports under the act shall be personally responsible for the filing, accuracy and completeness of the statements in the reports.

Section 212: Provides that nothing in title II shall relieve any person from complying with the provisions of any law affecting any labor organization unless such provisions would conflict with the provisions, or interfere with carrying out the objectives, of this act.

TITLE III—OBLIGATIONS TO MEMBERS OF LABOR ORGANIZATION

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONS ENTRUSTED WITH FUNDS AND PROPERTY OF A LABOR ORGANIZATION

Section 301: This section imposes upon every officer, agent, or other representative of a labor organization having any of the organization's money or property in his possession or custody by virtue of his position a duty to hold such money or property for the benefit of the members and for furthering the purposes of the organization and to handle it only in accordance with such duty and in a manner authorized by the organization's governing rules.

A right of action in any court of competent jurisdiction to obtain relief for disregard of such duty is conferred upon union members or principal officers. The applicability of other laws respecting the duties and responsibilities of union representatives is preserved.

OFFICERS AND THEIR ELECTION AND REMOVAL

Section 302: This section requires union constitutions and bylaws to state the qualifications and procedures for nomination, election, and removal of officers, which must conform to certain minimum standards. These include limitation of terms of office to not over 5

years for officers of internationals and 3 years for those of locals, and assurance of the right of any member to run for and hold office. Members must be given reasonable opportunity to nominate candidates and to participate in secret elections, and ballots and election records must be preserved for at least a year. Rights of a member under these provisions shall not be affected by a failure of an employer to pay dues checked-off. Union shall provide facilities and procedure to insure free, honest elections and accurate count of votes.

Unions are also required to have and follow procedures and standards insuring members the opportunity to remove elected officers from office by majority vote upon a showing that a substantial number of members desire a recall. Election of successors to recalled officers shall be held promptly and in accordance with required election standards.

The right to bring suit in any court of competent jurisdiction for enforcement of the provisions of this section or the election provisions contained in section 303 is conferred upon union members where the violations are not the subject of any pending action or proceeding brought by the Secretary under title IV. However, a grace period of 2 years or until the next constitutional convention is provided for unions which can make necessary changes only by a constitutional convention.

Section 303: Use of union or employer funds to promote the candidacy of any person in a union election is prohibited. It is also made unlawful for any person convicted of violations of this act to serve as an officer, agent or other representative of a union within 5 years of conviction, for any person to so serve while ineligible to vote because of a conviction for any crime, or for any union or union official having preventative power to permit any such ineligible person to serve.

SUPERVISORY CONTROL OF ONE LABOR ORGANIZATION BY ANOTHER

Section 304: Compliance with the provisions of this section is required of every labor organization assuming supervisory control over another. Such control shall be exercised only according to the governing rules of the labor organizations involved and to insure democratic, responsible, and honest administration of the subordinate body. The exercise of such supervisory control is limited to the period reasonably necessary for correction of evils. A presumption is created that a period of over 18 months is not reasonably necessary, but if rebutted, additional extension of supervisory control for not over 1 year may be approved. Limitations are imposed upon the union exercising supervisory control with respect to counting votes of delegates and transferring funds of the subordinate union.

EXERCISE OF RIGHTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATION MEMBERS

Section 305: This section prohibits disciplinary actions against union members for institution of actions or proceedings to enforce title III. It also preserves existing rights and remedies under union constitutions and bylaws and under State or Territorial law.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION, ENFORCEMENT, AND PENALTIES

ADMINISTRATION

Section 401: This section states that the provisions of the act, other than amendments of existing statutes, are to be administered by the Secretary who is empowered to take action and prescribe procedures necessary to effectuate act. Secretary authorized to make expenditures and appoint personnel, including attorneys who may represent him in any litigation subject, however, to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

Section 402: Provides for a Commissioner of Labor Reports, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to perform such duties under this and other statutes as the Secretary may delegate to him.

Section 403: This section authorizes arrangements by the Secretary for co-operation and assistance from other governmental and State agencies and provides for referral of evidence of violations of this act or other Federal law to the Attorney General or other Federal enforcement agencies.

INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Section 404: The Secretary is authorized to investigate alleged violations of provisions of act or rules or regulations issued thereunder, to publish information with respect to violations, and to make such investigations with respect to the accuracy and completeness of required reports as may be necessary in the enforcement of the act. He is also authorized to receive and take action upon complaints of violations of the act, but complaints shall not be made public except with complainant's consent. The Secretary or his authorized representatives are given powers of entry, inspection, and interrogation, as well as to hold hearings and make findings of fact and decisions based on them.

This section further authorizes the Secretary to establish Union Procedures Examining Boards to inquire into certain cases under the act, to conduct necessary hearings, and to make findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the Secretary. The subpoena power provided by the Federal Power Act is made applicable to the Secretary and his authorized representatives, including the Union Procedures Examining Boards, for the purposes of any inquiry under the act.

Section 405: The Secretary is authorized to bring actions to restrain or prevent violations of the reporting, union election and supervisory control provisions of the act and to compel compliance with the act and orders issued thereunder.

Section 406: This section confers jurisdiction on the U.S. district courts—and other appropriate Federal trial courts—of actions brought, under the act, by the Secretary or by union members.

Section 407: Under this section, service upon an officer or agent of a labor organization, in his capacity as such, shall constitute service upon the labor organization.

Section 408: This section directs the Secretary, upon determination that there is reasonable cause to believe that

there has been a willful failure to file required reports or that any person has violated the election, removal, or supervisory control provisions, to institute administrative proceedings conforming to the Administrative Procedure Act. Violations of provisions relating to election and removal of officers and the exercise of supervisory control may be referred to either a hearing examiner or a Union Procedures Examining Board. The procedure of these proceedings is outlined.

A final order of the Secretary, made on the record of the proceedings, may direct necessary corrective action and impose sanctions for not over 5 years—unless the violation continues longer. These sanctions consist, in cases where an employer is found to have willfully refused to file a report, of loss of the right to exercise any right or privilege under any Federal labor-management relations statute. A union found to have willfully failed to file a report or to have violated the provisions relating to the election and removal of officers and the exercise of supervisory control over subordinate bodies may also be declared ineligible to exercise any right or privilege under any Federal labor relations law and/or to have the income tax exemption granted by section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code. Where the outcome of a union election is found to have been affected by violations of the election provisions of sections 302 and 303, the final order may void the election and direct another under such supervision as may be necessary.

The decisions and orders of the Secretary under this section shall be conclusive upon other Federal agencies with respect to withdrawal of Federal rights and privileges involved, but they are subject to judicial review and enforcement as provided in section 409. Upon notice that a proceeding under this section is pending, Federal agencies may hold in abeyance or take other appropriate action in matters which may be affected by the Secretary's order.

Section 409: This section provides for enforcement of the orders of the Secretary, and for review of these orders upon petition of aggrieved parties, by the U.S. courts of appeals in the same manner as NLRB orders are reviewed. The commencement of enforcement or review proceedings will not stay the Secretary's order.

PENALTIES

Section 410: Willful violations of reporting and disclosure provisions of the act or applicable regulations are punishable by fine up to \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. A fine up to \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, may be imposed for willfully making false statements or failing to disclose material facts.

Section 411: A fine up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, may be imposed for willful destruction of records or documents required to be kept.

Section 412: Embezzlement of the funds of a union or a trust in which it is interested, or false entries in or destruction of books and records of a union

or such a trust with intent to defraud or mislead, are punishable by fine up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 413: This section provides for a fine up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for willful violations of provisions prohibiting use of funds to influence union elections and barring certain law violators as union officers—section 303—and of provisions protecting unions undergoing supervisory control—section 304(c).

Section 414: This section prohibits the offer, gift, solicitation, or acceptance, to or from each other, of payments in the nature of bribes by employers and their representatives and representatives of unions or trusts in which they are interested, with intent to influence actions—or to have actions influenced—as a representative of the union or trust or, in the case of an employer or his representative, with respect to labor-management relations of the employer. Violations are punishable by fine up to three times the amount involved or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both. Immunity would be provided from prosecution because of self-incriminating testimony given before courts and grand juries involving violations of these bribery provisions, except in the case of perjury or contempt arising from such testimony.

Section 415: This section amends section 302 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to extend its coverage to payments, first, by any person acting in the interest of an employer—as well as by the employer himself—to unions having members employed in the same trade or class as the employees of such employer—as well as to unions representing his own employees; and, second, to any employee or group or committee of employees of the employer for the purpose of interfering with, restraining or coercing the exercise by other employees of the employer of their self-organization rights under Federal labor relations laws—except compensation for regular services. The receipt of any such payment is also made unlawful.

This section also amends subsection (c) of section 302 so as to add to the types of payments excepted from the prohibitions of the section those made by employers to jointly administered trust funds established for the purpose of defraying the costs of apprenticeship and training programs.

TITLE V—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Section 501: This section provides that not more than three members of the National Labor Relations Board shall be members of the same political party. In addition, it makes clear that when the office of the General Counsel of the Board becomes vacant the President may designate some other officer or employee to serve as acting general counsel during the vacancy.

Section 502: This section amends section 6 of the National Labor Relations Act to make clear that, first, the Board may by rule or otherwise decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute where, in its opinion, the effect on interstate commerce is "not sufficiently sub-

stantial" to warrant exercise of its jurisdiction; and second, State agencies and courts may assume jurisdiction over such disputes where assertion of jurisdiction is declined.

Section 503: This section extends the secondary boycott provisions of the National Labor Relations Act to, first, direct coercion of employers to cease, or agree to cease, doing business with another; second, inducement or encouragement of employees individually to refuse to perform services; and third, to include within the scope of the provisions secondary employers who do not come within the act's definition of "employer," such as railroads and municipalities. The section makes clear that those prohibitions do not extend to activities directed at secondary employers performing for a primary employer "farmed out" struck work or those engaged at a common construction site with another employer with whom a lawful labor dispute exists with respect to wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees working at that site.

Section 504: This section amends section 8(b) of the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in, or threaten to engage in, organizational and recognition picketing where, first, the employer has recognized in accordance with the act any labor organization and a question concerning representation may not be raised under section 9(c) of the act, second, within the last preceding 12 months a valid election has been conducted, third, the union cannot establish the existence of sufficient interest on the part of the employees in having it represent them; or fourth, picketing has been engaged in for a reasonable period of time and an election under 9(c) has not been conducted. A savings provision makes it clear that this new provision is not intended to make lawful any activity which is otherwise an unfair labor practice under the act. The section further makes violations of the organizational and recognition picketing provisions subject to the mandatory injunction provided in section 10(l) of the National Labor Relations Act.

Section 505: This section amends section 8(d) of the National Labor Relations Act to make it clear that the collective bargaining requirements of section 8 do not require a party to a valid collective bargaining contract to bargain during the life of the contract with respect to any modification which would become effective before a reopening is permitted by the terms of the contract or by agreement of the parties.

Section 506: This section amends section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act to authorize the Board, upon joint petitions by an employer engaged in the construction industry and a labor organization acting in behalf of employees engaged in that industry asserting that the employer recognizes the union as a representative of his employees and has entered into a collective bargaining agreement with the union covering such employees, to certify such union as bar-

gaining representative without an employee election if a collective bargaining relationship has existed between the employer and the union prior to the current agreement and if the Board finds no substantial challenge by the employees of the representative status of the union.

Section 507: This section removes the provision in section 9(c) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act barring strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement from voting in representation elections.

Section 508: This section amends section 9(c) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act to permit the Board to conduct representation elections prior to hearings, where no substantial objection is made to such a proceeding.

Section 509: This section amends section 9(h) of the National Labor Relations Act to extend the non-Communist affidavit provisions to employers as well as unions, to require that affidavits relate to activities during the preceding 12-month period, rather than at time of execution of affidavit, and to require that they not have been found false by any court.

Section 510: This section saves acts performed prior to the effective date of this title against being treated as unfair labor practices under amendments to the National Labor Relations Act made by the title.

Section 511: This section provides that the effective date for amendments of existing law provided by this title shall be 60 days after date of enactment of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that members of the Committee on Labor who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the administration bill, entitled "the Labor Management Practices Act of 1959," which I join the Honorable CARROLL KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, in introducing, is tough enough to protect the union member and the general public from many of the abuses and racketeering practices disclosed in testimony before the McClellan committee. It is a practical, equitable, and inclusive approach to the complex problems in this field. It provides adequately for reporting and disclosure of the internal administration of union organizations. It requires reporting of financial transactions of labor unions and their officers and employees to prevent recurrence of the thefts of members' dues and welfare fund money.

The bill also provides standards for the periodic election of union officers so that leadership will truly represent the membership, and it requires reasonable procedures and safeguards against abuse of the trustee device, whereby unscrupulous union dictators have imposed their brand of leadership and control over the locals.

This program is not punitive, and honest labor leaders and employers have nothing to fear from its enactment. It will be welcomed by all fair minded parties in the field of labor management

relations, by loyal union members, and especially by the large small business fraternity, both of which groups have been so heavily and tragically victimized.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the House proceed at once to consider and enact labor reform legislation which is desperately needed. The recommendations contained in the President's labor message to Congress provide an excellent basis for consideration of this important subject.

In general, I believe the President's proposals provide a sound and practicable blueprint for action in the area of labor-management relations. His proposals are neither arbitrary nor punitive. They are designed to protect the interests of individual union members and the public.

Perhaps the ideal climate for good labor relations would be one in which the Government played no part. However, that is an ideal not likely to be soon realized, and, in the meantime, the Federal Government has a heavy responsibility to create and maintain a balance in this field which protects the interests of the public as well as labor and management.

I do not necessarily subscribe to, or agree with, every paragraph and every clause of the administration's bill, which I have been pleased to join in introducing today. Indeed, I have serious reservations as to the wisdom or necessity of one provision which would extend the non-Communist affidavit requirements to all employers.

However, in general, the proposals of the President provide language which is an excellent starting point for legislative action. The administration bill is much better and more effective than the so-called Kennedy labor bill recently introduced in the other body. Among the major differences between the two bills are the following:

First. The administration proposal deals with the problem of secondary boycotts, and the Kennedy bill does not.

Second. The administration bill deals with the problem of blackmail organizational picketing, and the Kennedy bill does not.

Third. The administration bill imposes upon union officers a higher degree of responsibility for the funds entrusted to them by union members.

I sincerely urge my colleagues in the House carefully to study the administration bill and to get behind its objectives without delay.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the administration's labor-management proposals are comprehensive and effective, and yet not oppressive to those who conduct their affairs in a fair and honest manner. Certainly, the vast majority of trade-union leaders have nothing to fear from this legislation, and I hope they will join in supporting it.

The bill, which a number of us are introducing today, is strengthened by provisions regulating trusteeships and union elections. The rank-and-file union member will be freed from the danger of having his local thrown into trusteeship by those seeking to wield

unscrupulous power over the members they are supposed to serve and to have a free hand in raiding the union's treasury. The bill's provisions concerning secondary boycotts and improper organization and recognition picketing are also greatly needed.

Naturally, this bill will not satisfy everyone in all particulars. I personally have reservations about section 509, which extends to employers the necessity of filing non-Communist affidavits.

Nonetheless, the need for legislation to curb the power of the "freebooter" in the labor movement is too urgent to go unheeded. I am confident Congress will not again abdicate its responsibility by failing to enact the reforms this bill would provide.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my wholehearted support to the bill introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], to carry out the program outlined in the President's labor message and I am proud to join him as a co-introducer of this bill which embodies the President's recommendation on this vital subject.

All of us realize that immediate legislation fair to labor, fair to management, and most important, fair to the American public, is vitally and urgently needed. But more than immediate action on legislation is necessary; it must be effective legislation designed to deal with the problems and the abuses that have been disclosed. The answer cannot be a law simply requiring that conscientious and law abiding labor leaders and businessmen fill out more complicated Government forms to further overburden Government files and personnel.

There seems to be general agreement that there should be legislation requiring disclosure of financial transactions, election safeguards, and democratic procedures in unions.

At a time when the world is scrutinizing not only what American leadership, but what the American way of life has to offer, the living skeletons in our labor management closet cannot remain hidden behind closed doors. The administration's proposal would, without Government domination of labor organizations or labor management affairs, afford means to insure that the individual rank-and-file member of the labor organization will have all the facts and methods to clean out and keep these closets clean. I have as much faith in the success of this approach as I do in our system of Government which to me is essentially the same. I urge this body to most seriously consider this bill.

I do not subscribe to the sleight-of-hand majority leadership approach as indicated in the other body to date as being the opposition party's strategy of considering some labor reforms or racketeering in one bill and other equally needed labor reforms in another. It is an obvious effort to ignore and shunt aside with a lick and a promise such vital other labor reforms as outlawing blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts, making union funds trust funds free from improper uses, and clarifying the no man's land jurisdictional issue,

retaining unto the States powers not specifically covered by Federal law.

These areas must get consideration this session, and in my opinion, the only chance for their serious consideration is as a part of an overall labor reform bill and it is obvious that many of the majority members who are responsive to labor leader wishes and do not want these equally needed labor reforms passed realize it too—as is demonstrated by their support of the majority sleight-of-hand strategy.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the Labor Management Practices Act of 1959 which embodies the administration's labor-management proposals. I recommend adoption of these proposals because they provide an effective procedure for dealing with abuses which have been uncovered.

Among other things, the administration's bill provides for much needed adjustments in our basic labor-management relations law. I am particularly impressed with the corrective amendments to the secondary boycott provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The loopholes in that act which permit direct threats and coercion of secondary employers are closed. In addition, employers may no longer be forced to agree to "hot cargo" clauses, through such threats and coercion.

The provisions are further strengthened by protecting individual employees of secondary employers from union inducement to commit a secondary boycott. These corrections insure that the really innocent third party in a labor dispute is more adequately protected. The secondary boycott has been a much abused weapon of the Teamsters Union in forcing small employers to accede to the union's demands. This bill will effectively eliminate this tactic from the arsenal of corrupt unions.

I should like further to point out that it is not necessary to consider labor reform legislation merely in its application to racketeering as compared to proposed amendments to Taft-Hartley. The provisions of the administration's bill which I have introduced today are, in my opinion, absolutely necessary in any legislation dealing with the abuses so forcefully brought out in the course of the McClellan hearings in the other body. Let us not waste time arguing about amendments to Taft-Hartley as being the subject of different legislation. I believe that if we are really sincere in wanting to have true antiracketeering legislation, this is the bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most important provisions in this bill is the provision which would outlaw black-mail picketing. There is no practice more reprehensible than the practice, widely adopted by some unions, of forcing unwilling employees to become members by coercing their employers to force them to join.

The effect of this provision is to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to coerce, or attempt to coerce, an employer to recognize or bargain with it as the bargaining repre-

sentative of his employees, or such employees to select or accept it as their bargaining representative, first, where the employer has recognized in accordance with the NLRB another labor organization, and a question of representation may not appropriately be raised under the act; second, where the employees have determined in an NLRB election that they do not wish to be represented by the labor organization; or third, where it is otherwise clear that the employees do not desire to be represented by the labor organization.

While decisions of the NLRB in Curtis Bros. and related cases indicate that picketing in the circumstances described above would presently be an unfair labor practice, these Board decisions have not been followed by some courts and consequently this area is shrouded in uncertainty.

This proposal makes it clear that a union may not picket or use other coercive tactics against an employer to force him to bargain with it while the employer is lawfully recognizing another union. It also protects the employer and his employees from harassment where an election under NLRB provisions has resulted in a "no union" certification or there are other factors which clearly indicate that the union is unwanted as the bargaining representative.

The union practice of disclaiming the right to represent an employer's employees and so avoiding an election while continuing to picket the employer can only be designed to force the employer to recognize the union against the wishes of the employees by causing him economic hardship and should be stopped. The provisions of this bill would remove any doubt as to the status of such picketing by declaring it an unfair labor practice.

USE OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES IN FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the President in his farm message has emphasized the use of our agricultural surpluses in a food for peace program. The President indicates in his message that he is setting steps in motion to explore anew with other surplus-producing nations all practical means of using our surplus agricultural commodities in promoting the well-being of friendly peoples in the world and in reinforcing the cause of peace.

It is a strange paradox that we in America must struggle with the problems involving agricultural surpluses while many of our friendly neighbors throughout the world do not have sufficient food to meet daily nutritional requirements. As the President has pointed out in his message, during the past 4 years our special export programs have already

provided friendly food-deficit nations with over \$4 billion worth of products which we have in abundance. None of us can sincerely doubt that food can be a powerful instrument in the world for building a durable peace.

I feel that it would be beneficial for the Congress to immediately express its approval of the President's food for peace suggestion in his farm message just presented, and I am therefore today introducing the following resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress to afford the fullest cooperation in achieving all practical means of implementing the President's food for peace program:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PERMIT THE USE OF FOOD FOR PEACE

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby concurs in the views of the President to the effect that food can be a powerful instrument for all the free world in building a durable peace, and that the United States and other surplus-producing nations should make the fullest constructive use of their abundance of agricultural products to this end.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby directed to review existing authorizations with respect to the disposal of agricultural commodities and products thereof, to utilize such authority to the fullest extent practicable in the interests of reinforcing peace and the well-being of friendly peoples throughout the world, and to report to the Congress such additional authorizations as he may consider desirable to achieve such purposes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join the remarks of my colleague in commending the President on his message to Congress on agriculture.

The facts and figures contained in the President's message concerning former agriculture programs enacted by Congress in recent years clearly shows the weaknesses in that program. I think it fair to state that the President and Secretary Benson have previously submitted recommendations indicating equal concern over the farm program—but Congress has utterly failed to measure up to the challenge and provide the Executive with a workable program—a program that will have the overall eventual effect of decreasing the cost of the farm program, decrease the surpluses, increase farmer incentive which is essential under our free enterprise system, and reduce to a minimum governmental control over the farmer.

I suggest to this Congress that the people of this Nation have a right to and are in fact looking to this body for a program that will accomplish the President's announced objectives. It accomplishes nothing in meeting this problem for the majority Members who have the primary responsibility in providing a program to accept that responsibility only with criticism of the Executive—when in reality the Executive is only carrying out the program provided by this body.

With storage of surpluses costing the taxpayer—who not only suffers as a taxpayer, but also as a consumer by artificially high price supports—exceeding \$1 billion, with proposed budgetary outlay for price-support programs in 1960 reaching \$5.4 billion, and with the built-in pressures in the present program to continue to increase these figures so long as this program remains in effect, Congress is presented with one of the primary challenges of this session—a challenge that must be met—a challenge that it is my hope the majority leadership will fully accept in the best interests of the sound fiscal future of our Republic.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTYRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I ardently support the President's thought, as expressed in his farm message, of using our surplus foods for the advancement of peace.

It should be noted that the Department of Agriculture has been cooperating in this concept, giving full recognition to the fact that diet has an essential bearing on the nature of man; that a full stomach empties the mind of desperate thoughts. The Department has been strengthening our relationships with our free friends abroad by utilizing governmental agencies and charitable organizations for the distribution of surplus food commodities, using every available agency to accomplish this purpose. And there is cogent evidence to point up the beneficial impact of such an approach.

One could never in good conscience question the wisdom of expanding this service of using our surplus commodities to advance minimum health standards for those who are free of despotism but enslaved by hunger—the concept that embodies the theme of “pieces of food to promote peace” unquestionably has great merit.

This program balanced with full use of commodities for our needy at home should be programs in which we all join in our efforts toward constructive solutions to these problems.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a time of crucial decision.

The President's message on agriculture outlines most graphically the challenges confronting the Congress.

It is essential that every Member of Congress carefully evaluate the recommendations submitted to us.

The President pointed out that the price-support and production-control programs have not worked; that the control program does not control; that the program is excessively expensive.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to stabilize farm prices and income for fiscal

1959 it is expected the Government will spend \$5.4 billion, or 7 percent of the entire amount of Federal expenditures. Yet this vast outlay of Federal funds has not solved basic farm problems. As the President has stated: “These heavy costs might be justifiable if they were solving the problems of our farmers and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But unfortunately this is not true.”

Farm legislation must be devised to meet the situation of today. As I recently said to the House in discussing this same farm problem, 30 economists testifying in November 1957 before the Joint Congressional Economic Subcommittee were polled as to where to reduce the nondefense budget and farm spending was listed as the No. 1 area for cuts.

I agree with the President that farm difficulties are not attributable to the farmers' failure but instead to the lack of programs of building markets instead of losing markets.

The proposals in the President's message are intended to build markets and on that one score alone deserve sympathetic study.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing be permitted to sit during general debate during the sessions of the House today and through Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems of the District of Columbia Committees of the House and Senate be authorized to submit its final report to the Clerk of the House during the recess of the House, in order to comply with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 172.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FLOOR STATEMENT ON LABOR REFORM BILL

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a companion bill to S. 505, which the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] introduced in the Senate last week. The bill is designed to strengthen legitimate unionism in this country by

cutting out the cancer of labor racketeering and corruption.

It is an improved version of the bill that passed by an 88-1 margin in the Senate last year. There is no reason why this bill, clearly aimed to curb union racketeering, should not pass through both Houses this year.

Unless it does, the racketeers will remain free to continue their flagrant abuse of the public trust, and antiunion extremists will continue to enjoy the opportunity of whipping up and distorting genuine public sentiment in order to indulge in a union-busting campaign with the aid of the McClellan committee disclosures.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of people in this country favor the prompt passage of a bill that would deal directly with the practices of union racketeers and corrupt management middlemen. So do the majority of thoughtful union leaders, because the great percentage of law-abiding and honest union workers have been smeared by the strong-arm and undercover practices of the James Hoffas, Dave Becks, and Johnny Dios. The whole labor movement has suffered for the sins of these few.

But the widely shared hope for quick reform will be indefinitely delayed if we make the mistake of combining the measures in this bill with the much more complex and controversial business of overhauling the Taft-Hartley Act to deal with the power balance between unions and management in new provisions affecting collective bargaining, secondary boycotts, union security and other areas.

It is true that this bill contains some amendments to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, but they do not deal with any of the broad issues affecting the economic or bargaining power of either side. These amendments are necessary if Congress is to attack effectively the problem of racketeering.

It would be a dishonest and self-defeating maneuver to use these amendments as a springboard for unrelated efforts to revamp the exciting labor-management structure. Such action must be provided for in separate legislation after a detailed and nonpartisan study has been made.

In capsule form, this bill contains these main provisions:

First. It requires a comprehensive and detailed report of a union's financial operations, with provisions for reporting transactions by union officials which might constitute a conflict of interest.

Second. It assures regular elections of union officials by secret ballot; requires prior notification of election dates; and allows members to nominate and vote for opposing slates without coercion or restraint.

Third. It provides criminal penalties for embezzlement of union funds and permits individual union members to sue union officers convicted of embezzlement. It also prohibits union leaders from obtaining loans greater than \$1,500 from the union organization.

Fourth. It prohibits “shakedown” picketing which has no other purpose than to force an employer to pay off the union officials involved.

Fifth. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to investigate any person or labor organization suspected of violating the reporting and disclosure provisions of the bill.

Sixth. It requires employers to report, with certain exceptions, any loans or other payments to officials or employees of a labor union other than regular compensation. It also forbids employers to make loans to any labor official who is seeking to represent the employees.

Seventh. It requires employers to list expenditures for labor relations consultants and expenditures in excess of \$2,500 for the purpose of persuading employees on matters pertaining to their right to organize and bargain collectively.

A more complete review of the provisions of the bill are contained in Senator KENNEDY's excellent presentation on pages 883-888 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 20, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, these are badly needed reforms. It is hard to see who can quarrel with them except the racketeers themselves and those who would rather preserve a political issue than pass legislation. I am confident that the Congress will press forward to speedy adoption of this or similar legislation.

AMEND THE CONSTITUTION—LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I am introducing in the House today. It states simply:

That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The judicial powers of the United States shall not give the Supreme Court of the United States the power to overrule, modify, or change any prior decision of that Court construing the Constitution of the United States or acts of Congress promulgated pursuant thereto.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within 7 years from the date of submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

It will be noted that the proposed amendment adheres closely to the language of the 11th amendment which was submitted by Congress to the States and approved by them to accomplish a like purpose. A precedent for the amendment thus is found in the 11th amendment which was adopted to overcome the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Chisholm v. Georgia* (2 Dall. 419, 1 Law Ed. 440) holding that a State could be sued by a citizen of another State in assumpsit.

Precedent No. 2 is found in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments which were adopted following the War Between the

States and which completely overcame the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Dred Scott* case, a decision which contributed materially to bringing about that unfortunate conflict.

Precedent No. 3 is found in the decision of the Supreme Court in *Pollock v. Lowe* (247 U.S. 165) which led to the adoption of the 16th amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for the amendment I am introducing has been pointed out most adequately by others in the recent past. I refer in particular to the report adopted by 36 State Chief Justices at their 1958 meeting in California in which they were critical of the U.S. Supreme Court declaring that the Court "has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint." This report, approved by the chief justices of three-fourths of the Nation's States, found that the present Supreme Court has abused the power given to it by the Constitution. The Court is pictured as invading fields of Government reserved by the Constitution to the States.

As I have repeatedly stated, we must not lose sight of the fact that the very name of our Nation indicates that it is to be composed of States. The Supreme Court of a bygone day said in *Texas v. White* 7 Wall, 700, 721 (1868):

The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union of indestructible States.

I would like to quote further from the report issued by the State chief justices as carried in the October 3, 1958, edition of U.S. News & World Report:

We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises * * *

It is strange, indeed, to reflect that, under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State governments, one branch of our Government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense and, in many respects, dominant power which it now wields. We believe that the great principle of distribution of powers among the various branches of government and between levels of government has vitality today and is the crucial base of our democracy.

We further believe that, in construing and applying the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, this principle of the division of power based upon whether a matter is primarily of national or of local concern should not be lost sight of or ignored, especially in fields which bear upon the meaning of a constitutional or statutory provision, or the validity of State action presented for review. For with due allowance for the changed conditions under which it may or must operate, the principle is as worthy of our consideration today as it was of the consideration of the great men who met in 1787 to establish our Nation as a nation.

I shall not quote further but I am confident most of my distinguished colleagues have read of the meeting and studied the report and the proceedings.

I call specific attention to the fact that there were 36 State chief justices who had a part in issuing the report on the

usurpation of powers by the Supreme Court. In no way can those who clamor for social reforms claim that the report was the work of a minority group or that it represented the thinking only of Senators and Representatives from the South. The 36 State chief justices, themselves responsible for protecting the individual as well as upholding our American way of life, have expressed their views. It may well be wise and prudent for the Supreme Court members, as well as the good people of these United States, to give careful study to the statements of these learned men of law.

I contend that it is of extreme importance that the judicial powers of the Supreme Court be limited so as not to give to the Court power to overrule, modify or change any prior decision of that Court construing the Constitution of the United States and acts of Congress promulgated pursuant thereto. This power is now practiced by the Court and can only be limited by a constitutional amendment such as the one I am introducing today. If this amendment, or similar legislation, is not passed promptly, the Supreme Court of the United States can be expected to continue to turn itself into a judicial oligarchy in which it amends the Constitution and the acts of Congress at its pleasure. The only place the people can turn to bring an end to this dangerous usurpation of power is to the Congress, praying that it submit to the States a constitutional amendment which provides a remedy.

I further refer my colleagues to an article in the U.S. News & World Report of October 24, 1958. In this article, Alfred J. Schweppe, a member of the board of editors of the American Bar Association Journal, a former dean of the University of Washington Law School, and a former president of the Bar Association of the State of Washington, states:

I absolutely reject the idea that the Supreme Court has the power to rewrite the Constitution according to its concepts of sociological or economic change. That is what the amendatory process is for. I do not accept Justice Douglas' blunt view that the amendatory process is too slow as anything but a violation of the oath to support the Constitution in all of its parts. * * * In my opinion, once the Court has construed a constitutional provision, that construction should stand until changed by amendment, unless later evidence is found of the intent of the framers of the provision which shows the first construction to have been erroneous. * * * Any other approach seems to me to lead to the inevitable conclusion that the Constitution is the plaything of the judges at any time in office. * * * My objection is to the reckless manner in which the present Court flouts the precedents laid down by the great Courts ahead of it and, glibly bypassing the constitutional amendment process of article V, rewrites the Constitution in its own image.

The Supreme Court, as a result of its recent decisions, must accept responsibility for much of the unrest among the people of the United States in the field of racial problems. It must accept responsibility for dividing the country unduly over school problems and for set-

ting back by half a century the efforts of men of good will in both races who through the years have striven to resolve racial problems harmoniously. The Court must take responsibility for cases of violence which have resulted from these and other decisions. Also, the Court must accept responsibility for the fact that confessed criminals now walk the streets free men—ready to strike again—released on the flimsiest of technicalities. The Court can never explain to my satisfaction its attitude toward Communists with whom it has ruled 32 times in the 39 cases involving communism under the present Chief Justice.

In summary, I believe, and I am confident a majority of the citizens of our Nation will agree with me, that unless there is persuasive evidence of the intent of the Constitution and its amendments that the prior decisions of the Court are wrong, these prior decisions should stand. That is what my amendment proposes. I do not think tradition and precedent should be ignored by the Supreme Court in its decisions. The framers of the Constitution provided orderly legal processes by which major issues can be decided. My amendment will reaffirm the significance of those processes and return the policy-making and legislative powers to the branches of Government which were intended to exercise jurisdiction over them. Ratification of this amendment would not freeze into effect the recent Supreme Court decisions which are so odious to many Americans. This is true because of the fact that those decisions are in themselves modifications or reversals of prior Court decisions which this constitutional amendment would uphold.

I trust that my proposal will have the support of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, but I challenge those who dissent to give the American people a chance to express themselves on the measure I am introducing today. Let the people vote. They are vitally affected by what the Court is doing but they have no way to express their approval or disapproval.

We have but to look around us to see the chaotic conditions we are experiencing. These conditions can be corrected. They should be corrected through the provisions of our Constitution. No greater form of government has ever been devised and we must not forget that our Government is built upon the standards of freedom. I urge favorable consideration of this proposed amendment to the Constitution so that the people may in fact speak for themselves.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida for the fine statement he has made.

He has pointed out a threat which confronts the American people, which confronts our whole system of government. He has pointed out the fact that the Court has disregarded the sacred doctrine of the law, the doctrine of stare decisis, which has been the doctrine that has preserved for us a system of govern-

ment of laws instead of a government of men. I hate to think it, but it is my opinion that we no longer have a government of laws; we have a government of men. The law of this land today is what the men on the Supreme Court say it should be. We are living under a dictatorship. The dictator is the Supreme Court. I certainly hope that the gentleman's bill will become law.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Florida and his views on these subjects. I would like to pursue one matter, if I may. That is whether or not the gentleman believes that under the Constitution as it is drawn today this Congress could take some action to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

I refer to article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which sets up the jurisdiction. The Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in four instances. In all other cases the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

It seems to me the Constitution, recognizing life tenure in one instance, gave to those who must go to the people the right and the authority to limit that jurisdiction of those who have a life tenure and who are not responsible to the people.

Does the gentleman agree that under the Constitution as it exists today this Congress if it would could pass legislation to limit that jurisdiction and accomplish some of the things which the gentleman has called to our attention today?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished and good friend from Ohio in his expert knowledge of the law. Of course I feel that there is also a remedy in the direction he has proposed. This Congress should explore every possibility of obtaining relief.

Mr. BOW. I simply want to read from the Constitution, if I may, so the record will be complete. I quote from article III, section 2:

In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

The founders of our country, the Constitution makers, recognized that the Constitution gave that authority to us and we should exercise it if we would.

Mr. SIKES. I think we should seek relief by every legal means that is open to us. We should pursue both the legislative and the amendatory process. The amendatory process is a slower one, but it has the effect of giving the people an opportunity to speak decisively and to write law that is permanent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my distin-

guished colleague from Florida for bringing to us today this splendid talk and suggesting to us many of the problems that we face now as we consider the effect of the decisions of our Supreme Court.

May I say to my distinguished colleague and personal friend that, as he has expressed, I am tremendously worried about the security of our country, just the basic security of this land that we love, as we view some of the decisions of the Supreme Court regarding their attitude on Communists, on passport legislation, on the right of a State to try a citizen suspected of sedition.

I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that many more of us from all the sections of this great country will become concerned and associate ourselves with the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and take some of the corrective steps that are necessary.

Mr. SIKES. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon his remarks, and particularly upon his statement that we should explore every avenue to correct the situation in which we now find ourselves.

I heard the statement made a few days ago on this floor by a gentleman from New York that this Supreme Court is one of the great Courts in the history of the Nation. I do not believe he will find many lawyers who will agree with him in that statement, in fact I do not know of a single one. The gentleman is a lawyer, but he served for a time in the Department of Justice, and apparently he has been contaminated by some of the views that seem to pervade that Department. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that today no lawyer can give a satisfactory opinion on the Constitution of the United States. There was a time, when a lawyer was called upon to decide a constitutional question, that he could do so with some degree of certainty, because he relied upon the Constitution. But, it is not a question of the Constitution today. It is a question of the philosophy of the Supreme Court at the particular time that the question upon which the opinion is rendered is being considered by the Court. This country has grown great and has developed one of the highest codes of justice found anywhere because our forefathers established a government of laws and not of men. As my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama just pointed out that situation is rapidly changing, and today it is becoming a government of men and not of laws. When you entrust the Government of this country to a small tribunal of nine people, you are establishing a dictatorship of the judiciary which might prove as oppressive as the dictatorships now ruling with an iron hand in some of the foreign lands.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has made a very sound observation.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the argument is being advanced over and over again here on the floor of the House, and I understand by even some members of the Supreme Court and certain advocates of these strange decisions of the Supreme Court, that we should have these unconstitutional Court decisions because of what people abroad think and because of certain criticisms of people abroad about the way our Constitution operates. Well, that being true, certainly these same people should get behind the gentleman's amendment and let us prove to the world how the American people and our American democratic representative processes really operate. Let the world see that we are willing to let the people decide this issue. I commend the gentleman for his forthright statement and for his amendment.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to join my colleagues in commending our distinguished colleague from Florida on the presentation he has made here today in the discussion of this important constitutional question.

Like many other colleagues and people throughout the United States, I am quite concerned—and it is a rather growing concern—as are others with the trend which we have observed for the last several years. It is a disturbing factor. And, I am glad to see the gentleman as well as others who are striving to seek a solution, a way, a method in an effort to bring about a change in this trend and bring about stable constitutional government.

At the opening of this session of the Congress I, along with other colleagues, joined the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, in the sponsorship of the bill the Congress considered in the 85th Congress.

Mr. SIKES. At that time H.R. 3.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; the identical bill I have introduced in this Congress is H.R. 518. As a matter of fact, the House passed it and only by one vote did it fail to pass the other body, as I understand. Now, I recognize the problem the gentleman has so well pointed up here today, and that is that in certain areas H.R. 3 will not reach the ultimate objective. At the outset of this Congress I also proposed a constitutional amendment in the hope of reaching some of these problems, not that I, in my own right as a Member of the Congress and as a lawyer, recognize that the Court in its decisions in some of the cases has followed precedent and followed the law of the land itself. But, I do recognize that there must be avenues of approach to the problem, and I want to join others in seeing that a way is found that these constitutional questions can be brought to the forefront and to the attention of the American people.

When, in the memory of this generation, does the gentleman remember, Mr. Speaker, have we before seen members of the highest court of the land going out to the American people as a forum and trying to apologize or defend their own actions? Yet we have seen this within recent months. After the action of the chief justices of the State supreme courts and after other pronouncements have been delivered all over the land, we find the Chief Justice publicly trying to defend the Court. And we find another member of the Court trying to defend their action. And only recently another member in New York tried to do the same thing.

I say to my colleagues that in my opinion this is a matter which the members of the Court themselves must have some feeling about or they would not be trying to explain to the American people their attitude, trying to defend themselves in their decision, in this most important fight. And I say it is a fight throughout the Nation. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia who said a few days ago that it may be one issue at the moment affecting one section of this country, or one issue today, but tomorrow it may affect another section, or next year, or in the years to come on other issues; we had better take warning now or the greatest system of government yet devised will be threatened and seriously jeopardized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me, so I may reply to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman will find the answer to that question, that is why those judges are going about trying to defend their decisions, if he will look at that little pamphlet that came out carrying the decision in the segregation case; if he will look at the bottom of page 9, and then over through page 10 and on to 11 and read the reasons given by Chief Justice Warren, for his conclusions, he will understand why he is trying to justify those conclusions. Of course, I do not believe what he said. To me his argument was that no one, for example, could become a clergyman unless he acquired his education while associating with a group of sinners. A colored boy could not be taught honesty unless he got next to a crooked, dishonest white lad.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman may be correct, but I still feel that since so many people are calling this issue to the attention of the American people, they, themselves, must feel that there is something here that dangerously threatens the Court and that sacred instrument, the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. And in addition consider the absurdity of his reasoning. Take another look at it—read the decision again.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate our distinguished friend and colleague from Florida on the clarity

of the exposition which he has made today of his proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I commend a careful reading of that proposed amendment together with a careful reading of the remarks of the gentleman from Florida to all of our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that we are entering into an era of judicial dictatorship. We may have, indeed, entered that era already. During the past 4½ years the Supreme Court of the United States has undertaken to announce a doctrine and a policy of utter and complete disregard for established judicial precedents, and for the written word of provisions of the Constitution itself as well as of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware that the safety of the people and the security of our Nation are, indeed, the supreme law. Yet by recent actions of the Supreme Court of the United States convicted conspirators against the peace and security of the Government of the United States and of the people thereof have been turned loose to continue their diabolical conspiracy to destroy, to overturn, to overthrow the Government and the Constitution of the United States under which and under God our Nation and our people have achieved a position of world leadership unequalled in the entire history of civilized man.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now and the place is here for the elected Representatives of the people of the United States to assert the right of this legislative branch of our Government, indeed, to assert the right of the people of the United States to prevent this country from being crushed under the heel of dictatorship, whether it be by the judicial branch or by any branch of our Government. God forbid that the rights and the liberties of all of our people be destroyed by the malignant desire of 9 black-robed justices of any court on earth.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Recently, within the last year or two, a former president of the American Bar Association told a subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee that 90 percent of the lawyers of America had no respect for the legal ability of the present members of the Supreme Court. Also, recently, within the last few years, this Court rendered a decision in the Anti-Subversive Activities Control Board case which was described by a member of the Justice Department as being the greatest victory the Communists have won in the last decade.

With those situations existing, no respect by a majority of the members of the bar of America, and the Communists having a field day in America, certainly some action should be taken to curb the Supreme Court.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I commend my colleague from Florida for offering this. I, too, want to challenge the people who seem

to be so interested in minority groups, and so forth. Let us submit this question to the American people and let them pass on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules, it will be necessary to get the consent of all the other gentlemen having special orders.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those desiring to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject may do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yielding to the desire of the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Speaker, I shall extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has that consent.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has shown a depth of understanding in this instance, which he always shows when he presents a program on the floor of the House of Representatives. Members who are interested in the safety and the preservation of the charter of our Government should take time to read and digest the brilliant remarks that are his in the course of this present speech. I certainly commend them to careful study.

Only today, Mr. Speaker, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a local paper published in Shreveport, La., the Shreveport Times, scoring our highest judicial tribunal for a further breach of the important rule of stare decisis in a very recent decision. The question involved in this decision was whether peace had returned to this country, and this Court so interpreted a statute of Congress as to cause a duly convicted felon to be released from custody. In doing so the U.S. Supreme Court overturned previous decisions of many years standing. The final result is that it released one duly convicted criminal who had legally been charged, tried, and convicted of a heinous crime and is now at large on society to further pursue his criminal designs and intent.

The gentleman from Florida is certainly pursuing the right course when he suggests to the House that the Supreme Court be curbed from further usurping powers of government. Our forefathers expressed the fear that if dictatorship ever came to our land under our Constitution, it would be through the usurpation by the judiciary of powers under our Constitution. As surely as the sun rises in the east in the morning, this tribunal of nine black-robed Justices who are ensconced in that marble palace across the way in front of the Capitol are moving toward a judicial dictatorship in this land. Honest, loyal, fearless, red-blooded Americans will realize the sinister influence that falls over

the Capitol now like a pall and will move aggressively to prevent further usurpation of judicial powers and functions by these nine men who compose our U.S. Supreme Court.

I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for this opportunity and hope he continues his fine work in behalf of a well-balanced American Government under our Constitution.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida has presented to the House a most forthright statement, and for his action and courage he is to be commended.

The issue presented is certainly timely and stimulating to our thinking. I should not go so far as to say that the U.S. Supreme Court is engaged in a diabolical conspiracy against the United States. Certainly I do not impugn the patriotism of the members of the Court. However, I do agree that some of the major problems with which we are confronted today are the result of actions and decisions of the Court and the Chief Executive. I refer to the decisions of the Court in the school desegregation case and the actions of the Chief Executive in ordering the paratroopers to invade one of our sovereign States—an action which was wholly improper, and certainly not the best method to proceed on in the matter.

While we, as Members of Congress, receive many letters calling for legislative action on the problems produced by this critical situation, I want to repeat and to emphasize that these problems are not the result of actions of the Congress but of the Chief Executive and of the Court. Certainly we should, in discharging our responsibilities, with respect to these problems, explore every possible avenue of approach to their solution.

I commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing this matter before the House for discussion. Certainly both the legislative approach and the process of amending the Constitution afford means for the solution of our domestic issues of present-day concern.

When a majority of the chief justices of the supreme courts of our States, by deliberate action and resolution, censure or condemn the decisions and the trend of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, certainly we are more than justified in exploring all means possible to resolve these serious conflicts. Our judges are not prone to condemn other judges and therefore their action in this instance is most significant.

We can discharge our responsibilities by endeavoring to be constructive rather than impugning the patriotism of any of our fellow citizens.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the concern being expressed here on the floor today with regard to certain Supreme Court decisions and with the general observation that the Court by some of its decisions has placed on its shoulders some of the responsibility for conditions generated by those decisions. But I suggest, that to leave the problem there is to shirk our coequal legislative responsibility of doing something about those decisions where we clearly have the constitutional power and, in my opinion, the clear duty in protecting the best interests of all the people of this Nation, to

pass legislation to clarify or overcome some of those decisions and thus remedy the ill effects stemming therefrom.

Congress has, indisputably on the record, shirked this responsibility and duty in this respect.

As the ranking minority member of the Special Subcommittee on Supreme Court Decisions of the Judiciary Committee of the House, in the 85th Congress, I joined the members of that subcommittee in working diligently and I believe sensibly in reporting out legislation to overcome some of these decisions.

A bill similar to the one I introduced to clarify the Mallory decision, mentioned by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] was reported after lengthy hearings and consideration but was assigned to the legislative graveyard in the dying hours of the session even after being passed by the House with a substantial majority.

A bill that passed the House unanimously in its final form, to overcome some of the effects of the Yates decision by strengthening the Smith Act by redefining the meaning of the word "organize" in order to outlaw the organizing of Communist cells in this country, received similar graveyard treatment.

H.R. 3, the Smith States rights bill, one of which I introduced, met the same fate, and the State laws on sedition remain in jeopardy so long as the Nelson case decided from Pennsylvania remains in full force and effect—unchallenged.

I have reintroduced these bills again this session hoping that this Congress will accept its true responsibility and take effective action on these matters. To do less, is to shirk our duty and responsibility. I suggest that the last Congress thus must also accept its full share of blame for the after-effects of some of these decisions, due to its position of inaction. I trust the record this session will reflect a willingness on the part of the majority leadership to exert leadership in this vital field.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although time does not permit thorough and complete observations of the amendment submitted by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], I deem it necessary to immediately rise in opposition to his proposal. The ostensible purpose of his proposed amendment is to force the Supreme Court into a death grip with its own precedents. The amendment apparently seeks to command the Court to an absolute compliance with the rule of stare decisis.

Such a rule of strict compliance with precedent would stifle growth and development in the law. As Justice Brandeis pointed out, stare decisis is not "a universal, inexorable command—but simply a rule of policy—and usually the wise policy, because in most matters it is more important that the applicable rule of law be settled than that it be settled right."

The Court should certainly have the right to overrule its earlier decisions. As Justice Brandeis further said, "The Court bows to the lessons of experience and the force of better reasoning, recognizing the process of trial and error, so

fruitful in the physical sciences, is appropriate also in the judicial function. The decision of the previous case may have been rendered upon an inadequate presentation of then existing conditions, but the conditions may have changed meanwhile. Moreover, the judgment of the Court in the earlier decision may have been influenced by prevailing views as to economic or social policy which have since been abandoned. In cases involving constitutional issues of the character discussed, this Court must, in order to reach sound conclusions, feel free to bring its opinions into agreement with experience and with facts newly ascertained."

I cannot and do not agree with all of the decisions of our Supreme Court. My disagreement, however, does not compel me to curtail or restrict the Court in the conduct of its judicial business. The Congress has unquestioned authority to take legislative action to correct its specific differences of opinion with the Court's judicial interpretations.

The proposed amendment appears to be another in a series of vindictive attacks on the Supreme Court for its school-desegregation decision of 1954. Today's arguments in support of the amendment were not supported by legally convincing arguments.

As a Member of this body and as a lawyer, I do not feel called upon to defend the Supreme Court from the attack upon its integrity which has been implied by this proposed constitutional amendment and by argument in its support. The Court has faced such attacks before and will survive.

However, if the proposed amendment should by any chance clear this Congress and be adopted by the several States, the Court would be fatally frozen to its precedents—both wise and unwise. As a matter of fact, the adoption of this amendment would clear the way for electronic Supreme Court decisions. The precedents could be card punched and placed into the machine and judicial decisions could be promptly played out without time-consuming argument or concern for changing conditions.

The proponents of this amendment argue against the threatened dictatorship of the judiciary—and yet by this very amendment they would seek to establish an irrefutable dictatorship of past precedents—the rule of uncomplaining dead men. Errors in the law would remain so forever. Such is not my concept of the judicial process.

I earnestly urge my colleagues to abandon their massive attack on the Supreme Court. Congress has suitable remedies to correct almost every Supreme Court decision in which it is displeased. These remedies should be attempted before massive retaliation is undertaken against the Court.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Constitution introduced by my good friend and colleague from my neighboring State of Florida, Mr. SIKES, has my wholehearted support and I fully concur in his remarks concerning the urgent necessity for the adoption of this amendment by this Congress.

I have read the report which was adopted by 36 State chief justices at their 1958 meeting, in which report these chief justices from 36 of our sovereign States declared that our Supreme Court has tended to adopt the role of policymaker without judicial restraint. I have had occasion to personally discuss this report with nearly half of these chief justices, and on many occasions before and since this report was issued I spent hours with many outstanding men, going over this matter, including a great and good American who we thought made one of the greatest speeches ever made on this issue, and I am referring to our own Judge J. Ed Livingston, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, one of the most learned lawyers of all time.

I believe that all right-thinking Americans will support my good friend and colleague, Bob SIKES, in his proposed amendment.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, over 120 Members of the House have today gone on record in support of a bill establishing certain minimum standards of unemployment compensation in addition to standards that have been in the Federal law since enactment of the original Social Security Act in 1935.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point a list of those Members who have asked to be announced in support of this bill, some of whom may also intend to sponsor it.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; LE-ROY H. ANDERSON, Montana; VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ohio.

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; ROSS BASS, Tennessee; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; CHESTER BOWLES, Connecticut; CHARLES A. BOYLE, Illinois; JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana; DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Maryland; JAMES A. BURKE, Massachusetts; JAMES A. BYRNE, Pennsylvania.

A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri; STEVEN V. CARTER, Iowa; EMANUEL CELLER, New York; FRANK M. CLARK, Pennsylvania; JEFFERY COHELAN, California; ROBERT E. COOK, Ohio.

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Connecticut; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey; JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana; CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; ISIDORE DOLLINGER, New York; HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts; CLYDE DOYLE, California; THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York.

LEONARD FARBEIN, New York; MICHAEL A. FEIGAN, Ohio; PAUL A. FINO,

New York; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; GERALD T. FLYNN, Wisconsin; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island; ARME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; SAMUEL FRIEDEL, Maryland; JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania.

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, New Jersey; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland; NEWELL A. GEORGE, Kansas; KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; KENNETH J. GRAY, Illinois; EDITH GREEN, Oregon; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., Pennsylvania; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Michigan.

HARLAN HAGEN, California; SEYMOUR HALPERN, New York; DENVER D. HARGIS, Kansas; WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio; JAMES C. HEALEY, New York; KEN HECHLER, West Virginia; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania; LESTER HOLTZMAN, New York.

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California. JOSEPH E. KARTH, Minnesota; GEORGE A. KASEM, California; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin; ELIZABETH KEE, West Virginia; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; CECIL R. KING, California; MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio; JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois; FRANK KOWALSKI, Connecticut.

RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Maryland; JOHN LESINSKI, Michigan; ROLAND V. LIBONATI, Illinois.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts; PETER F. MACK, Jr., Illinois; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; DON MAGNUSON, Washington; FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota; LEE METCALF, Montana; JOSEPH M. MONTTOYA, New Mexico; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Pennsylvania; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Illinois.

ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois; JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Wisconsin; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., Massachusetts; JAMES C. OLIVER, Maine.

THOMAS M. PELL, Washington; CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky; CHARLES O. PORTER, Oregon; ADAM C. POWELL, New York; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; STANLEY A. PROKOP, Pennsylvania; ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois.

JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Pennsylvania. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; PETER W. ROBINO, Jr., New Jersey; BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Illinois.

ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New York; D. S. SAUND (Judge), California; JOHN F. SHELLEY, California; GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, Illinois; NEAL SMITH, Iowa; LEONOR K. SULLIVAN (Mrs. John B.), Missouri; LUDWIG TELLER, New York; FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey; HERMAN TOLL, Pennsylvania; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington.

CHARLES A. VANIK, Ohio; ROY W. WIER, Minnesota; LEONARD G. WOLF, Iowa; CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin; HERBERT ZELENSKO, New York.

Why do we now so urgently need minimum standards provided in this bill?

Because, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of these standards, we have been slipping backward since 1939. The need has

been becoming more urgent year by year. Lack of these standards has cost individual workers, their families, and the national economy dearly.

In 1939 the weekly benefits payable to insured unemployed workers actually averaged 50 percent of their full-time weekly wages. Today, average weekly unemployment compensation benefit payments have fallen until they are now less than 33 percent of full-time weekly wages.

Because we do not have an adequate standard setting the minimum number of weeks for which an insured unemployed worker is entitled to benefit payments, workers are exhausting their benefit rights long before finding work. As will be shown later in this discussion, duration of unemployment has tended to increase year by year so that the 39 weeks' duration provided in this bill is needed to meet the needs of the unemployed individual and the economy as a whole.

Weekly benefit payments are today so inadequate that insured workers and their families are moving from the unemployment compensation rolls to the relief rolls, where they remain for weeks and even months before obtaining re-employment.

For the most part a catchup bill, it proposes to get back to where we were in 1939, back to 50 percent of full-time weekly wages, to a duration more nearly adequate to meet anticipated periods of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, the need for minimum standards to make benefit amounts and duration more nearly adequate is generally recognized.

Dr. Arthur Burns, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors to President Eisenhower, has stated the need for Federal minimum benefit standards.

The Federal Advisory Council on Economic Security has stated the need for Federal minimum benefit standards.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report of April 1958, stated the need for Federal minimum benefit standards.

For years Secretary of Labor Mitchell and President Eisenhower have described the need for minimum benefit standards and have called upon the States to raise the weekly amounts and extend duration.

This year, in his budget message of January 19, President Eisenhower restated the need in stronger terms than he had ever before used—and he did not this time pass the buck to the several States. He said:

Our unemployment compensation system has again demonstrated its importance in providing income for the unemployed and thereby supporting the economy while alleviating hardship. Temporary assistance of the kind provided by the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 is in no sense a substitute for widening the coverage of unemployment compensation and extending the duration of benefits and increasing benefit amounts under the Federal-State system. I have many times urged such action. I urge it again now with added conviction as a result of last year's experience.

Mr. Speaker, as we believe our discussion today will make clear, years of experience have shown that the only way

to get such action is through Federal action, action by this House and by this Congress. We shall show why it is that no State has done, and no State feels it can run the risk of doing, by itself, what it is generally agreed should be done in every State. We believe the case for Federal action in this session of this Congress is clear.

What would this bill do?

It would continue the present Federal-State unemployment compensation system, but it would correct inadequacies in that system by establishing certain minimum standards which every State must meet in order to be entitled to the benefits provided.

The proposed bill would:

First. Provide for the payment of weekly unemployment compensation benefits to insured eligible unemployed workers of not less than 50 percent of the individual's weekly wages so long as that amount is not more than two-thirds of the weekly average wage in the State, an amount which, as Members know, varies from State to State.

Second. Establish a uniform benefit period of 39 weeks for insured and eligible unemployed workers.

Third. Include within the system employers of one or more individuals, except for domestics and agriculture employees.

Fourth. Permit States free choice in providing for uniform rate reductions to employers as well as individual experience-rated reductions in payroll tax rates.

In addition, the bill would allow that part of the payroll tax which is paid into the Federal Treasury, three-tenths of 1 percent, to be used to aid States whose reserves may be depleted by heavy drains upon State unemployment insurance trust funds.

We deem it important to emphasize what the proposed bill would not do. It would:

First. Not require any appropriation by Congress.

Second. Not change the present Federal-State system of operation.

Third. Not provide for any increase in the present Federal tax upon payrolls.

Moreover, in all probability it would not require an increase in the total payroll tax paid in any State beyond the 2.7 percent originally contemplated in title III of the Social Security Act of 1935 and unemployment compensation laws qualifying thereunder.

At present, with wholly inadequate weekly benefit payments being given to insured unemployed workers for inadequate periods of time, tax rates for some employers in some States have been cut almost to the vanishing point. Unemployment insurance trust funds wax fat while workers and their families go hungry. A table setting forth the relationship among lean benefits and fat trust funds and nominal tax rates will be introduced later in this discussion.

Through the years, the States have been divided and conquered by the argument that in no State could members of the legislature afford to obey their best instincts, their best judgment as to what was best for the individual unemployed

worker, best for the economy of the State and Nation. In each State, the argument was made that decent standards would be disastrous, that other States having lower weekly benefit payments for shorter periods of time might offer plants the inducement of lower and lower tax rates on payrolls.

This is the long trail of degradation, a 20-year-old story of retreat from standards that seemed minimum in 1939.

Lack of these nationwide minimum standards has permitted the development of a profit incentive running into more than \$1 billion a year. This incentive has spurred on special interests to hold down benefits both in amount and duration, to subvert and defeat the very purpose of the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation.

In asking for special orders to discuss this bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], myself, and perhaps other colleagues, wish to put in the Record for the Members of the House and for the American people not only the essential facts about the bill, a section-by-section analysis of the bill, and the text of the bill itself, but also some evidence showing the nature and magnitude of the need for such legislation.

We propose to indicate in a brief and preliminary way the human and economic costs of not having such minimum standards, in terms of individuals, local communities, States, markets for manufactured and agricultural goods and services and in terms of the economic health, strength, and security of our Nation.

Let it be said, first, that we would be much better off today if, instead of having passed a Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act last year which offered extension of benefits that were inadequate both in terms of weekly amounts and number of weeks duration, and was used by only 17 of the 48 States, we had enacted in 1958 the bill for nationwide minimum standards of unemployment compensation that was before us then and has been introduced again today in substantially the same form.

A year ago it was raining. We were having what was politely termed a "recession." We had more than 5 million unemployed. It was suggested that, instead of going out in the rain to fix the roof, the Federal Government lend such States as wished to borrow a supply of dishpans to catch the rain as it came through the roof.

Today, a year later, it is raining again. For many areas of the country and for millions of unemployed workers and their families, it has never stopped raining. The number of unemployed is again above 4 million and rising.

More than 2½ million insured unemployed workers have exhausted their rights to benefits under State laws; more than 650,000 workers in 17 States taking advantage of the dishpan policy adopted in 1958 have exhausted both their rights under the regular State law and the temporary Federal extension.

Exhaustions are continuing today at the rate of 250,000 a month, with the expiration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act set for April 1,

1959, unless extended. And in the name of economy the administration has taken a firm position against any such extension, counting on the lapsing to save a few hundred million dollars toward the balancing of an unemployment-as-usual, defense-at-bargain-rates budget.

If the present Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act were to be renewed, and many of us may think it must be continued in some form, not more than one-third of all who have exhausted their benefits under the permanent State and the temporary Federal laws would be likely to benefit to the extent of a single weekly benefit check.

For those who have suffered such long unemployment as to have been unable to establish a qualifying earnings record in a new benefit year, remedies, relief and restoration to employment must be found in other legislation such as increased Federal grants for public assistance to share the heavier burden now being borne by States and local communities struggling with persistent recession, in the pending area redevelopment and community facilities bills, in beefed up housing, airport and highway programs, in action to stop price gouging by monopolistic corporations "administering" higher and higher prices while sales lag and inventories pile up.

This is simply to say that enactment of this bill is one of the imperatives that this Congress must act upon if it is to meet the expectations of the American people as expressed so clearly last November and, incidentally, as the Employment Act of 1946 has intended all along. We shall not leap at one bound, or by the enactment of one law or one appropriation, from chronic mass unemployment, we shall not liberate ourselves by a single act from the pernicious anemia of underutilization of men, machines and money to the good health of full utilization contemplated and provided for in the Employment Act of 1946.

But enactment of this bill early in the session will help. It will be an omen and a promise that will give heart to people everywhere, to every employed and unemployed worker and, yes, to businessmen and financiers making plans for a future of expanding markets. They will know that this Congress is not going to be controlled by timidity or greed, either by fear of unemployment so heavy as to make payments of adequate benefits impossible or so costly as to require some employers to increase their payroll taxes slightly above the two-thirds of 1 percent or less that is now being paid by too many in too many States.

Before yielding the floor to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ], with whom I am a working partner on this bill, I want to offer for the RECORD certain basic documents.

First, I insert at this point in the RECORD a very brief summary of the bill:

PROPOSED FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BILL

The proposed Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards bill continues the

present Federal-State unemployment compensation system. However, it corrects inadequacies in the present State laws by establishing additional standards to be met by States as a condition of employers getting credit against the Federal unemployment tax, and by establishing a system of reinsurance to aid depleted State reserves.

Such Federal standards are to be effective July 1, 1960, allowing a sufficient period for all State legislatures to meet and enact necessary amendments to State laws.

The proposed bill has the following provisions:

I. BENEFITS

Each individual's primary benefit shall be not less than 50 percent of his weekly wages subject to a maximum primary benefit of not less than 66⅔ percent of the State's average weekly wage. (The claimant shall receive either the maximum or 50 percent of his weekly wages, whichever is less.)

II. DURATION

Benefits shall be payable to all unemployed insured individuals for a period of not less than 39 weeks, provided they meet all eligibility requirements under the State law.

III. ELIGIBILITY

A. No wage qualifying requirement in a State law can be more restrictive than base year earnings of 30 times the weekly benefit amount, or 1½ times high quarter wages, or 20 weeks employment.

B. State benefits cannot be denied or reduced because of the receipt of payments under a plan established to supplement unemployment benefits under the law.

IV. COVERAGE

Employers who have one or more individuals in their employ at any time during the taxable year will be covered.

V. FINANCING

A. States will be permitted to provide for uniform rate reductions to all employers as well as individual experience-rated reductions.

B. Proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act will be earmarked in a Federal unemployment account in the Federal Treasury. Such account will be used for (a) paying the Federal and State administrative expenses (including the establishment of a contingency fund) and (b) reinsurance grants to those States who are in financial difficulty because of high rates of unemployment.

The need for some standards in unemployment insurance has been recognized by the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security (report to the Secretary of Labor, Dec. 3, 1958), by the Rockefeller Brothers report (April 1958), by the Governors of several States, and by Arthur F. Burns, president, National Bureau of Economic Research.

The standard in this bill on the benefit amount is the formula recommended repeatedly to the States by President Eisenhower in the Economic Report.

This proposed bill would not require any appropriation by Congress.

Second, a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS BILL

The bill recognizes that in order to achieve the goals of employment stabilization and security against unemployment and in order to strengthen the economy and the welfare of the Nation, certain improvements in the unemployment compensation program are necessary. It extends to certain new categories of workers the benefit of the unemployment compensation program and prescribes certain uniform minimum standards with respect to weekly unemployment compensation benefits and the

period of time for which such benefits will be payable. It also provides for the establishment of a fund composed of present Federal unemployment tax collections from which the administrative costs of the program will be paid and from which reinsurance grants will be made to States which suffer excessively high rates of unemployment.

Section 2 of the bill establishes the additional standards which a State law must meet in order to be certified by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of permitting credit against the Federal tax for employer contributions under the State law. The additional standards cover the following areas: (1) The maximum and minimum weekly benefit amounts provided by the State law; and (2) the duration for which benefits are payable under the State law.

Among those who have recognized the need for Federal minimum benefit standards are:

(a) The Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report of April 1958.

(b) The Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security.

(c) Dr. Arthur Burns, former economic adviser to President Eisenhower.

1. WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT

Section 2 requires that the maximum benefit under the State law be not less than an amount equal to two-thirds of the average weekly wage within such State. It also requires that subject to this maximum every individual receive a benefit equal to at least one-half of the individual's average weekly wage. In no case would an individual receive a benefit in excess of the State maximum.

Thus, if the average weekly wage in covered employment in State X is \$66, the State law must provide a maximum weekly benefit of at least \$40. An individual whose average weekly wage is less than \$66 would be required to receive a weekly benefit of at least 50 percent of his own wage. The individual who earns \$50 a week would only receive a weekly benefit of \$25 a week. The individual who earns \$60 a week would only receive \$30 a week. In no case, however, would State X be required to pay anyone more than \$40 weekly. Individuals who receive \$80 a week would be entitled to the \$40 but no individual who earns more would be paid a greater benefit.

The requirement that individuals be entitled to receive at least 50 percent of their average weekly wage as a necessary goal is consistent with the recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his Economic Report. As Secretary of Labor Mitchell has pointed out in letters to the Governors of all States, a weekly maximum along the lines recommended in this bill is necessary to accomplish the recommendations of the President.

In view of the inaction by State legislatures in meeting these goals, it is clear that if they are to be accomplished, congressional action along the lines recommended by this bill is necessary.

2. BENEFIT DURATION

Section 2 of the bill would require that all eligible individuals be entitled to benefits for at least 39 weeks of unemployment. This does not mean that every individual will automatically receive 39 weeks of benefits in a year. State laws all require that the individual be unemployed and that he be able and available for work during each week of unemployment.

With continued unemployment, the need for benefits of sufficient duration for all unemployed individuals is apparent. President Eisenhower also recommended that duration be uniformly extended for all claimants. While his recommendation to the States was

limited to duration of 26 weeks, the continuation of heavy unemployment and the continued increase in the number of persons exhausting the benefit rights indicate the present need for benefits for a duration of longer than 26 weeks. The need for 39 weeks has already been recognized by the last Congress which enacted the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

3. SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The only standard with respect to disqualification provisions of State laws applies to benefits paid under privately established supplemental benefit plans. Section 2 would specifically preclude the denial or reduction of State benefits because of the receipt of private supplemental unemployment benefits. Only four States now reduce benefits because of the receipt of SUB. Thirty-eight (38) States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii hold that the payment of supplemental unemployment benefits does not affect an individual's right to State unemployment compensation benefits.

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill extends the coverage of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of one or more individuals.

The extension of coverage to employers of one or more is consistent with the recommendations made by President Eisenhower. It does not mean that housewives who employ a domestic or a farmer employing one individual from time to time will have to pay unemployment contributions with respect to such individual. The present definition of employment which excludes domestic and agricultural service is not changed in this bill.

Subsection (c) of section 3 adds definitions of "benefit year," "base period," "high quarter wages," and "average weekly wage" to the present definitions. These definitions are necessary in order to avoid contravention by a State of the amendments proposed in subsection (a).

Section 4 would give additional freedom to the State in determining the methods of reducing employer's taxes under the State law below 2.7 percent. Under present law, if a State wishes to impose a tax lower than 2.7 percent on employers, it may only do so by instituting a system which rates individual employers on the basis of their own experience. A State which desires to levy a uniform rate of less than 2.7 percent on all employers is now unable to do so.

This amendment would permit a State to levy a uniform contribution rate of less than 2.7 percent. It would also permit a State which desires to continue a system of individual employer experience rates to continue to do so. In short, it imposes no new Federal requirement; it relaxes the existing requirements.

Section 5 amends those provisions of the Social Security Act relating to grants to States for administration of State unemployment compensation laws by providing that all collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act are earmarked in the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund. This account was established by Congress in 1947.

Section 5 provides that all funds for administration of State laws, including contingency amounts which are to be expended only in the event of unforeseen changes in economic conditions, shall be charged against the Federal unemployment account. Unemployment compensation administrative expenditures of the Department of Labor shall also be charged to the Federal unemployment account.

Section 6 repeals provisions of the present law inconsistent with the changes made in this bill.

Section 7 provides that a State whose accumulated funds for unemployment compensation has reached a precariously low

condition will be entitled to a reinsurance grant from the Federal unemployment account. The amount of such grant will be limited to three-fourths of the excess by which compensation payable under such State law exceeds 2 percent of the State taxable payroll. In other words, only where unemployment benefits cannot be financed through a 2 percent contribution rate will the State receive any Federal grant. To the extent that its costs exceed 2 percent, it will still be required to finance one-fourth of the costs out of State funds.

In order, however, to avoid the possibility of a State permitting its fund to reach a precariously low condition in order to receive a Federal grant, the bill requires that as one of the conditions of eligibility that whenever a State's fund drops below 6 percent, it imposes a minimum rate of contribution of at least 1.2 percent.

Section 7 changes title IX of the Social Security Act and makes certain technical changes in section 904 in order to achieve consistency with the substantive amendments proposed by the bill.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the above provisions extending coverage and establishing benefit standards which must be met by State laws shall be effective as of July 1, 1960. This would give to the States sufficient time to make the necessary statutory changes in their State unemployment compensation laws before the standards become effective.

Third, the text of the bill itself:

A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that (1) the systems of unemployment compensation as now constituted and administered throughout the several States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment which were sought to be achieved by the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935; (2) there are substantial categories of workers and employees who, though needful of the benefits afforded by unemployment compensation are not covered for such benefits; (3) the amounts of unemployment compensation payable to unemployed persons who are covered are, in most cases, inadequate to provide the worker and his family with the basic necessities of life; and (4) there are great disparities between the States with respect to the terms and conditions under which workers may become eligible for unemployment compensation, as well as with respect to the amount of such compensation and the length of time for which it is paid. Therefore it is the purpose of the Congress, in order to achieve the goals of employment stabilization and security against unemployment, and in order to strengthen the economy and provide for the general welfare of the Nation, to extend to certain new categories of workers the benefits of unemployment compensation, to prescribe certain minimum standards with respect to the terms and conditions under which unemployment compensation will be paid, as well as to the amounts and the length of time for which such compensation will be payable, and to otherwise extend, revise, and improve the unemployment compensation program.

SEC. 2. Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

"(6) the maximum weekly compensation payable under such law shall be an amount

equal to at least two-thirds of the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, such average to be computed by the State agency of such State on July 1, 1960, and on July 1 of each succeeding year on the basis of the wages, including amounts excluded therefrom under section 3306(b)(1), paid during the last full year for which necessary figures are available;

"(7) the weekly compensation payable to any individual shall be (A) the maximum weekly compensation payable under such law, or (B) an amount (exclusive of any compensation payable with respect to dependents) equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, whichever is the lesser;

"(8) compensation shall not be denied to any eligible individual for any week of total unemployment during his benefit year by reason of exhaustion or reduction of benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credit, until he has been paid unemployment compensation for not less than 39 weeks during such year;

"(9) compensation shall not be denied in whole or in part to any otherwise eligible individual because of the receipt of any payment under any plan or system established for the purpose of supplementing the compensation payable under the State law; and

"(10) in order to be eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits an individual shall not be required (A) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of the amount of the individual's weekly unemployment compensation benefit, to have been paid, during his base period, more than 30 times the amount of his weekly unemployment compensation benefit; (B) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of such individual's high quarter wages, to have been paid more than one and one-half times the amount of his high quarter wages; or (C) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement based on weeks of employment, to have been employed by an employer for more than 20 weeks in his base period."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) EMPLOYER.—For the purposes of this chapter the term 'employer' means any person who, at any time during the taxable year, has one or more individuals in employment."

(b) Section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) BENEFIT YEAR.—For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'benefit year' means the period prescribed by State law, but not in excess of 52 consecutive weeks, for which an eligible individual may receive weekly unemployment compensation benefits.

"(p) BASE PERIOD.—For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'base period' means the period prescribed by State law beginning not prior to the first day of the fifth full calendar quarter immediately preceding the beginning of the benefit year.

"(q) HIGH QUARTER WAGES.—For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'high quarter wages' means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual in the calendar quarter of the base period for which his total wages were highest.

"(r) AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGE.—For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'average weekly wage' means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (1)

in case the period used is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high quarter wages, divided by 13; or (2) if some other period is used, divide by the number of weeks, during the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined by State law)."

SEC. 4: (a) Section 3302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) **ADDITIONAL CREDIT.**—In addition to the credit allowed under subsection (a), a taxpayer may credit against the tax imposed by section 3301 for any taxable year (1) an amount equal to the amount, if any, by which 2.7 percent exceeds the amount for which credit is allowed under subsection (a), if the contributions to a pooled fund required to be paid by him with respect to the taxable year are at a uniform rate imposed by State law on all employers, or (2) with respect to the unemployment compensation law of each State certified for the taxable year as provided in section 3303 (or with respect to any provisions thereof so certified), an amount equal to the amount, if any, by which the contributions required to be paid by him with respect to the taxable year were less than the contributions such taxpayer would have been required to pay if throughout the taxable year he had been subject under such State law to the highest rate applied thereunder in the taxable year to any person having individuals in his employ, or to a rate of 2.7 percent, whichever rate is lower."

(b) The first sentence of section 3303(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting "(2)" after "section 3302(b)".

UNEMPLOYMENT REINSURANCE

SEC. 5. Sections 301 and 302 of the Social Security Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNT"

"SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each fiscal year thereafter, amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) received during such period under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and covered into the Treasury. There is also authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Unemployment Tax Account such additional sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) (1) For the purposes of assisting the States in (A) the administration of their unemployment compensation laws (including administration pursuant to agreements under title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952), (B) the establishment and maintenance of a system of public employment offices in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 3, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, and (C) carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 there is hereby authorized to be expended, for payments to the States, from the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the Appropriation Act or Acts for the Department of Labor for each such fiscal year.

"(2) In addition to the sums authorized to be expended under paragraph (1) of this subsection for the purpose of assisting the States in the administration of their employment compensation laws, there is hereby authorized to be expended from the Federal

Unemployment Account for such purpose, as provided in section 302(a) (2), for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount not in excess of \$25,000,000.

"(c) There is authorized to be expended from the Federal Unemployment Account for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the Appropriation Act or Acts for the Department of Labor to be necessary for the administration by the Department of Labor of its functions under (1) the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, (2) this title and titles IX and XII of the Social Security Act, (3) the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, (4) title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and (5) title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

"PAYMENT TO STATES"

"SEC. 302. (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such law during the fiscal year for which such payment is made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (A) the population of the State; (B) an estimate of the number of persons covered by the State law and of the cost of proper and efficient administration of such law; and (C) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant. The Secretary shall not certify for payment under this subsection in any fiscal year a total amount in excess of the amount specified for such purpose in the Appropriation Act or Acts for the Department of Labor for such fiscal year.

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the amount specified in the Appropriation Act or Acts for the Department of Labor for the purpose of assisting the States in administering their unemployment compensation laws is, because of changes in economic conditions which were unforeseen at the time such amount was specified, less than the amount necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such laws, he is authorized to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the States for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, in addition to the amounts authorized to be certified under paragraph (1), amounts the total of which shall not exceed the amount authorized to be expended by section 301(b) (2).

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (a), pay from the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification."

SEC. 6. Sections 901, 902, and 903 of the Social Security Act are hereby repealed and the last sentence of section 904(b) is revised by striking out "section 1202(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1202(e)".

SEC. 7. Title XII of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XII—GRANTS TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUND"

"SEC. 1201. (a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3), a State shall be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter, commencing with the quarter beginning on July 1, 1960, if the balance in such State's unemployment fund on the last day of the preceding quarter is less than the amount of the compensation

paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the 6 months' period ending on such last day.

"(2) A State shall not be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter commencing after the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961, and prior to the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1966, if with respect to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961.

"(A) the balance in the State's unemployment fund on the computation date for such year was less than an amount equal to 6 per centum of the most recent annual taxable payroll or less than the amount of the compensation paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the 2 years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount is greater; and

"(B) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund during such taxable year was less than 1.2 per centum.

"(3) A State shall not be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter, commencing after the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1966, if with respect to any year within the five most recently completed taxable years—

"(A) the balance in the State's unemployment fund on the computation date for such year was less than an amount equal to 6 per centum of the most recent annual taxable payroll or less than the amount of the compensation paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the two years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount is greater; and

"(B) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund during such taxable year was less than 1.2 per centum.

"(4) A reinsurance grant shall be an amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') to be equal to three-fourths of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State unemployment compensation law during the calendar quarter for which such grant is made over 2 per centum of the taxable payroll for such quarter.

"(5) As used in this section, the term 'computation date' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 3303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized and directed, on application of a State agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions entitled a State to reinsurance grant provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions have been met, the Secretary is directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amount of such grant, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amounts granted for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Secretary deems necessary or relevant to the performance of his duties thereunder.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (b), make payment from the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for unemployment compensation benefits; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury and credited to the Federal Unemployment Account unless such State is eligible for a reinsurance grant.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Unemployment Account, as repayable advances (without interest), such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title."

Sec. 8. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this Act shall be effective as of July 1, 1960.

Sec. 9. This Act may be cited as the "Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959".

Fourth, a memorandum with six appendixes setting forth the background of the present demand for enactment of such uniform minimum standards as are provided in this bill:

BACKGROUND ON UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Public concern with shortcomings in the Federal-State unemployment insurance system in this recession has had two significant effects:

(a) It resulted in Federal intervention to extend duration, on a temporary basis only, during the last session of Congress, and

(b) It has brought about a wide area of public agreement that Congress should legislate Federal standards in the coming session.

Not since the enactment of the Social Security Act have so many circumstances combined to encourage the enactment of Federal benefit standards.

1. Until 1953, Congress expressed itself in terms of studies and reports on the performance of unemployment insurance (e.g., "Issues in Social Security," staff report prepared for the House Ways and Means Committee, January 17, 1946, and report of the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance, 1949.) During this period, a wide area of agreement on the criteria of desirable unemployment insurance laws was achieved.

2. Beginning in 1954, the President adopted a policy of proclaiming these criteria or standards as the responsibility of State legislatures, and reiterated his recommendations each year (see attached app. A).

3. Federal intervention in 1958 (Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act) marked a basic change in public policy, based on the admitted failure of States to achieve the recommended standards without Federal help.

4. As a result of the recession, the Governors of many States are asking for Federal benefit standards (app. B). On December 5, the Democratic Party's Advisory Council on Legislation recommended Federal benefit standards. On November 19, Dr. Arthur Burns, former Economic Advisor to President Eisenhower, declared that Congress should liberalize unemployment insurance by permanent amendments in coverage, benefit amounts, and duration (app. C).

5. The Federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Security, appointed by the Secretary of Labor to advise on policy, recommended on December 4, 1958 (the first time in its history) specific Federal benefit standards (app. D). All public members and labor members united in the majority report; two employer members (one not present at final vote) favor some Federal standards.

6. This recommendation has gone to the Secretary of Labor, who has stated:

"It is my hope . . . that the Congress next year when it convenes will look at the whole problem of unemployment compensation, both in terms of duration and in terms of benefits, so that we can set at the Federal level a standard which the States

could properly follow." (Speech to Bricklayers Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., Oct. 13-17.)

7. The Vice President has sensed the political importance of unemployment insurance improvements and asked for extending coverage to 12 million more workers and incorporation of temporary extensions into permanent law (app. E).

8. In Congress a great many Senators and Representatives want the opportunity to vote on an economic issue as clear-cut as improvement in unemployment insurance. At the time of election, 37 of the 47 new Congressmen and 10 of the 15 new Senators had part or all of their constituency classified as areas of substantial labor surplus (over 6 percent unemployed). In all constituencies, over 12 million people this year experienced unemployment and over 8 million had direct experience with unemployment insurance, many for the first time.

9. A straight Federal standards bill may be one of very few pieces of welfare legislation acceptable to the administration and to Congressmen who want a balanced budget and no inflationary pressures. (Such a bill requires no Federal appropriation and would probably take more funds out of the economy than it would pay out in benefits until the cyclical recession of 1962-63.)

These nine political and economic facts add up to the greatest opportunity for improving unemployment insurance in over 20 years.

APPENDIX A

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT, 1957

One set of proposals aimed at reinforcing the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance has resulted in important actions. During 1954, Congress extended the coverage of unemployment insurance to 1.4 million employees of firms with 4 to 7 persons on their payrolls and 2.5 million Federal civilian employees. In the last 3 years, 38 States have raised weekly benefits, 12 have lengthened the potential duration of benefit payments, and 4 have extended coverage to firms with less than 4 employees.

Additional improvements are needed. First, benefits are still inadequate in relation to wages. It is again suggested that the States raise the dollar maximums so that the great majority¹ of covered workers will be eligible for payments equal to at least half their regular earnings. Second, the duration of benefits is still inadequate in many States. It is again suggested that the States and Territories which have not yet done so lengthen the maximum term of benefits to 26 weeks for every person who qualifies for any benefit and remains unemployed that long. Third, important classes of workers are still not covered. It is recommended that the Congress extend unemployment insurance to the 1.8 million employees of firms with 1 to 3 persons on their payrolls who are still uncovered in many States, to ex-servicemen, and to employees in Puerto Rico. Also, the States are urged to include the 4.5 million persons who work for them for their political subdivisions.

Another problem requiring attention is the loss of income caused by temporary disabilities not related to the work of employees. For some years, four States have

¹The Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, has since estimated that for the great majority to receive benefits equal to half their earnings, the maximum benefit must be set at 60 to 66½ percent of each State's average weekly wage.

had insurance programs covering such contingencies, and many employers provide similar protection. A recommendation will again be presented to the Congress to provide temporary disability insurance benefits for employees in the District of Columbia. It is hoped that the States that have not as yet done so will take the necessary legislative steps to protect their workers against temporary off-the-job disabilities.

APPENDIX B

STATE GOVERNORS SPEAK FOR FEDERAL STANDARDS IN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

On February 13, 11 Governors from States with 40 percent of the workers covered by unemployment insurance sent a telegram to President Eisenhower urging action on the recession. It stated, in part:

"A practical program to bolt the growing recession should include . . . establishment of minimum Federal standards for unemployment insurance benefits.

Gov. Robert Meyner, New Jersey; Gov. Averill Harriman, New York; Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, Colorado; Gov. Herschel C. Loveless, Iowa; Gov. Edmund S. Muskie, Maine; Gov. Foster Furcolo, Massachusetts; Gov. G. Mennen Williams, Michigan; Gov. Orville L. Freeman, Minnesota; Gov. Robert D. Holmes, Oregon; Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, Rhode Island; Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, Washington.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, has declared himself for Federal benefit standards. The Rockefeller Brothers Report, issued in April 1958, states, in part:

"UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

"A second vitally important part of our social insurance structure—unemployment insurance—should be greatly strengthened by the extension of coverage, increase in benefits, and lengthening of their duration. Minimum Federal standards should be enacted to encourage this improvement. At the same time, State administration of the program should be strengthened by obtaining more skilled personnel, providing more specialized services, and establishing more cooperative and effective relationships with industry. Particular help should be given to middle-aged and older persons having difficulty finding jobs."

On December 6, 1958, Governor Williams reiterated his views on benefit standards:

"Unemployment compensation needs to be improved, and some kind of retraining program provided for those who are displaced by machines. I have come to the considered conclusion that we can never meet this problem exclusively at the State level. We must look to the Federal Government, to provide decent nationwide standards of unemployment compensation. Michigan cannot hope to provide these standards alone, as long as we are faced with the unfair competition of other States which are trying to attract industry with low wages and low standards of job insurance."

The Detroit AFL-CIO merger convention said:

"The unemployment compensation system is designed not only for the protection of the laid-off worker, but also as the Nation's first line of defense against depression. It will never fully serve either purpose until the Federal administration stops addressing fruitless exhortations to the State legislatures, and puts a floor of Federal standards under the job insurance systems of every State. I'm sick and tired of getting letters from the President of the United States, urging the legislatures to do something about this. I think it's high time the President did something at the Federal level—and if he doesn't, I think the new Congress should, and will."

On January 13, 1959, Governor Meyner in his annual message to the New Jersey Legislature explained the need for Federal standards in unemployment insurance:

"One difficult aspect of this subject is the unfair competitive condition fostered by the failure of the Federal Government to provide any kind of minimum standards for all States. Here, the Federal Government, having initiated the program on a basis calling for State administration, has wholly failed to prevent some of the States from adopting programs so inadequate as to be almost meaningless. Such programs, of course, cost little, and this fact has been used to entice industry to those States. This activity, in turn, creates local unemployment in areas where realistic programs have been put into effect, causing severe drains upon their resources.

"A single State, by itself, is powerless to legislate in any effective way to cure this condition. We should press for Federal action so that we can carry our own program forward."

APPENDIX C

[From Daily Labor Report, Nov. 19, 1958]

FORMER PRESIDENTIAL ADVISER ADVOCATES MORE LIBERAL JOBLESS INSURANCE SYSTEM

The former Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, Arthur Burns, in a Washington, D.C., speech, declares "the most useful step that we can take in the near future" to strengthen the automatic stabilizers of the economy "is to liberalize our unemployment insurance system.

"This year the Congress responded to urgent demands by extending the duration of unemployment benefits. However, this legislation was of a temporary character, it failed to embrace all of the States and it did not deal with the matter of coverage or the size of the benefits. It would hardly be wise to wait for another recession before we again tackle the problem of unemployment insurance. A reform, I think, is long overdue. The benefits provided for insured workers are inadequate in many States. The maximum weekly benefit represents 50 percent or more of the average weekly wages of insured workers in only six States. The duration of benefits is 26 weeks or longer for all eligible claimants in only seven States. More serious still, about 13 million workers are entirely excluded from the protection of unemployment insurance. Now that our economy is once more expanding, we are in a position to proceed deliberately and to carry out permanent improvements in unemployment insurance, not only with a view to mitigating individual hardships, but also with the objective of increasing the resistance of our economy to a future recession.

"Once we succeed in devising a system of insurance that is comprehensive in coverage and tolerably suited in its scale of benefits to the needs of the unemployed in a modern economy, we should be in a position to deal with the difficulties of recession in a calmer atmosphere than existed early this year. Our situation would be better still if we could devise a politically acceptable means of automatically varying tax rates with the ups and downs of economic activity."

APPENDIX D

FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYMENT SECURITY RECOMMENDS STANDARDS

At its meeting on December 3, the Federal Advisory Council recommended the following Federal standards in unemployment insur-

ance. (All public and labor members supported this report. One employer member filed his own statement advocating some standards. Another employer member not present at the final vote also favors standards.)

"1. The great majority of covered workers, as recommended by the President, should be eligible to receive as unemployment benefits at least one-half of their regular weekly earnings. In order that the great majority may get this amount, the States will need to provide for a maximum weekly benefit amount equal to no less than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent of the statewide covered average weekly wage.

"It is recommended that this provision be implemented in 3 stages: for the first 2 years following the effective date of the provision the maximum weekly benefit should not be less than 50 percent of the average weekly wages of workers in the State covered by the State unemployment insurance law; for the next 2 years not less than 60 percent; and after that not less than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ percent.

"2. Unemployment benefits for at least 30 weeks during a 1-year period should be uniformly provided for all claimants who remain unemployed for that long and are otherwise eligible for benefits.

"3. No State should require more than 20 weeks of employment during the claimant's qualifying year for eligibility for benefits. It is recognized that evidence of substantial attachment to the labor force should be required to justify the duration provision proposed. It is believed that 20 weeks is an adequate test. We therefore recommend that not more than 20 weeks of work should be required as an eligibility test.

"4. The offset against the Federal tax should be reduced from 2.7 percent to 1.7 percent for employers in those States which do not meet the above-mentioned conditions. As in the past, those States that meet the Federal conditions shall continue to have an offset of 2.7 percent. Those States which fail to comply shall be permitted an offset of 1.7 percent. It is not the intention of this recommendation to raise additional revenues but rather to remedy serious deficiencies in the present system. Moreover, in the event that any revenues do accrue because of failure of a State or States to meet Federal conditions, these funds should be added to the amount of the Federal loan fund."

APPENDIX E

NIXON SEES POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF IMPROVING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

A dynamic and growing economy is bound to cause hardships to some of the people involved in the process of change. As new businesses come into being and others grow, some will be replaced. And in a free economy we must expect readjustments from time to time—such as the one through which we are passing at present. These occurrences will mean temporary unemployment for some American workers.

With these facts in mind, consideration should be given to instituting permanent reforms in our system of unemployment insurance.

Specifically, to the extent feasible, the 12 million workers not now covered should be brought under our unemployment compensation system.

The prolongation of benefit periods now in effect as a temporary measure should be made permanent.

The Federal and State Governments should work together toward the objective of establishing higher minimum standards for the level of benefits, their duration, and their coverage.

These proposals are sound not only for reasons of plain humanity, but also because the flow of income provided by more ade-

quate unemployment compensation serves to cushion the impact of the business cycle. The faster we carry out this basic reform, the greater can be our assurance that occasional setbacks in economic activity, such as are bound to occur, will remain brief and mild. Source: Address of the Vice President of the United States before the 50th anniversary conference of the Harvard Business School Association, Boston, Mass., September 6, 1958.

APPENDIX F

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S BUDGET MESSAGE CALLS FOR HIGHER UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS

In his budget message of January 19, 1959, the President said:

"Our unemployment compensation system has again demonstrated its importance in providing income for the unemployed and thereby supporting the economy while alleviating hardship. Temporary assistance of the kind provided by the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 is in no sense a substitute for widening the coverage of unemployment compensation and extending the duration of benefits and increasing benefit amounts under the Federal-State system. I have many times urged such action. I urge it again now with added conviction as a result of last year's experience."

(The weekly benefit amount contained in this proposed uniform minimum standards bill are the same as those urged by the administration for several years.)

My colleague and working partner, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] will, I believe, in the course of his remarks present for the RECORD certain other material that will be helpful to Members and the American people in considering this vital matter.

Let me conclude with this word:

We of the Committee on Ways and Means who sat through the 1958 hearings on unemployment compensation, both during consideration of the temporary unemployment compensation bill and, late in the session, proposals such as this bill for permanent improvement in the Federal-State system itself, were, and, I believe, are now convinced that these uniform minimum standards are many years overdue. We have too long been persuaded by counsels of timidity and fear into acquiescing in chronic malnutrition of our people and our economy. It is time for us to pick up our bed and walk.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the 12 exhibits therein referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today in the minds of hundreds of thousands of workers who are unemployed and other millions of workers now at work, the bill to establish certain addi-

tional minimum standards of unemployment compensation carries a top priority tag.

This bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], by myself and at least 121 Members of both parties in this House, and a similar one sponsored by 31 members of the other body, would mean an increase of \$19 in weekly benefits paid an unemployed worker receiving the average Michigan weekly wage and would extend benefits 19 weeks beyond the present potential duration of 20 weeks. Over a period of 39 weeks of unemployment, it would mean an increase in benefits for such a worker of \$1,311 in high velocity purchasing power.

If in 1958 the Congress had enacted such standards, it would have meant a net increase of \$1,011 over the amount to which such a worker was entitled under both the State unemployment compensation law and 10 additional weeks of benefits provided by the Federal Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, due to expire April 1, 1959.

In a moment I propose to put in the RECORD a table showing the net loss sustained by the average worker in each State because of the lack of benefit standards provided in this bill. Overall, the loss of benefits, of high velocity purchasing power, amounts to \$1,344,800,000. Without the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, the loss would have been \$392,400,000 greater, or \$1,737,200,000.

As an example of what is being done to workers, to their families and to business in the great many labor surplus areas all over this country, I want first to cite figures for the city of Detroit showing how inadequate weekly unemployment compensation benefits are, both in amount and duration.

TABLE I.—Relief data for the city of Detroit, 1956–58

	1956	1957	1958
Number of families receiving direct relief in December.....	5,585	7,471	16,007
Number of screening interviews, year 1.....	41,548	37,700	64,324
Key reasons for applying for relief:			
Unemployment benefits exhausted.....	6,916	3,328	16,692
Unemployment compensation benefits not adequate.....	1,612	936	3,744
Separated from job and not entitled to unemployment compensation benefits.....	7,606	7,488	10,764

¹ Years ended Jan. 11, 1957, Jan. 10, 1958, and Jan. 9, 1959.

NOTE.—Annual figures on number of applicants interviewed who were seeking welfare aid and their reasons for seeking relief are weekly average figures for the annual periods indicated projected on annual basis. The figures may cover some families whose breadwinner was interviewed more than once in the same year.

Source: Detroit Public Welfare Department.

I have here a table showing certain relief data for the city of Detroit for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958. This table, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, shows these two shocking facts:

First, From 1956 through 1958 the number of families applying for direct

relief in Detroit, because unemployment compensation benefits they were receiving were not adequate, was four times as high in 1958 as in 1957, totaling 936 in 1957, and rising to 3,744 in 1958.

Second, The number of families applying for relief because their unemployment compensation benefits had been exhausted rose from 3,328 in 1957 to 16,692 in 1958, an increase of five times.

Again to emphasize the inadequacy of unemployment compensation benefit payments, using the city of Detroit as an example, I ask unanimous consent to insert another table showing the distribution of Government surplus commodities in the city of Detroit in October 1958, compared with October 1957.

This table shows that in 1957 in Detroit, 860 families whose breadwinner received unemployment compensation simultaneously qualified to receive surplus commodities averaging about \$25 a month because compensation payments were so low and that 1 year later, in October 1958, the number of such families had increased to 14,862.

The table also shows that, although no family whose breadwinner was "temporarily unemployed" in 1957 qualified to receive Government surplus commodities, 1 year later in October 1958, 3,637 families whose breadwinner was "temporarily unemployed" qualified to receive such commodities. This classification of "temporarily unemployed" appears to include persons who were not covered by unemployment insurance.

In October 1958, 233,644 persons in 62,714 Detroit families received surplus commodities, 4 times as many as a year ago.

TABLE II.—Distribution of Government surplus commodities, city of Detroit, October 1958 compared with October 1957

	October 1957	October 1958
Number of families serviced.....	19,117	162,714
Number of persons serviced.....	61,764	232,644
Means of support of families receiving surplus:		
Welfare relief.....	3,652	8,089
Unemployment compensation.....	860	14,862
Low income.....	2,658	20,443
Temporarily unemployed.....	0	3,637
Aid to dependent children.....	7,152	8,716
Other means of support.....	4,800	6,960

¹ Welfare department estimates surplus commodity costs at about \$25 per month for each family. At this rate cost of such commodities would have totaled \$478,000 in October 1957 and \$1,568,000 in October 1958.

² Estimated from figures published by source.

Source: Detroit Department of Public Welfare.

Again, as an example of inadequacy of present duration of benefit payments, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD tables III and IV, which show for selected Michigan labor market areas, first, the totals for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958, of claimants exhausting unemployment-compensation benefits before being reemployed, and, second, a comparison for the month of December in the years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Table III shows that 91,458 Michigan workers exhausted their benefit rights

in 1956 before being reemployed, 76,897 in 1957, and 251,999 in 1958. Of this 1958 total, 107,020 also exhausted their extended benefit rights under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act.

TABLE III.—Number of claimants exhausting unemployment compensation benefits,¹ selected Michigan labor market areas, total for years, 1956–58

	1956	1957	1958	
			Regular programs ¹	Double exhaustees ²
Michigan.....	91,458	76,897	251,999	107,020
Detroit ³	56,021	36,860	146,901	65,580
Flint.....	3,000	4,579	13,318	5,142
Lansing.....	1,780	2,148	5,983	2,068
Saginaw.....	1,275	1,329	3,226	1,295
Muskegon.....	1,985	2,522	4,667	1,358
Jackson.....	871	933	3,199	1,351
Bay City.....	1,049	1,312	3,066	1,205

¹ Includes workers exhausting benefits under the State, veterans, and Federal employees unemployment compensation programs. Does not include additional workers covered by the program for railroad workers who also exhausted their benefits.

² Includes workers who, after June 30, 1957, exhausted benefits under the program which regularly covered them, and who also exhausted the additional benefits provided under the temporary unemployment compensation program.

³ Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties.

Source: Michigan Employment Security Commission.

TABLE IV.—Number of claimants exhausting unemployment compensation benefits,¹ selected Michigan labor market areas

	December 1956	December 1957	December 1958	
			Regular programs ¹	Double exhaustees ²
Michigan.....	6,735	6,031	19,040	13,665
Detroit ³	4,115	2,883	13,423	8,102
Flint.....	110	102	332	324
Lansing.....	139	136	242	250
Saginaw.....	76	78	173	148
Muskegon.....	187	166	273	185
Jackson.....	68	91	114	137
Bay City.....	66	151	217	140

¹ Includes workers exhausting benefits under the State, veterans, and Federal employees unemployment compensation programs. Does not include additional workers covered by the program for railroad workers who also exhausted their benefits.

² Includes workers who, after June 30, 1957, exhausted benefits under the program which regularly covered them and who also exhausted the additional benefits provided under the temporary unemployment compensation program.

³ Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties.

Source: Michigan Employment Security Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table marked "Table 5" showing by States the cost to the average unemployed worker of not having the minimum benefit standards provided in this bill. It will be noted for certain States, such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, that the loss for the average unemployed worker—that is the worker receiving the average wage in the State—was zero or relatively small. But even in these States, for workers paid more than the average wage, there was an individual cash loss. And in these States further improvement in benefit standards was retarded by threats of competition offered by other States having smaller weekly amounts and shorter duration.

TABLE V.—What the absence of Federal benefit standards in 1958 cost a typical unemployed worker who earned the State's average wage

State	Average weekly wage, 1957	Benefit amount paid ¹	Benefit amount under standard	Average duration exhaustees regular State program (weeks)	Additional duration TUC	Total average duration	Loss per week (col. 3—col. 2)	Total benefits lost by workers unemployed 9 months (col. 3×39 weeks)—(col. 2×col. 6)=dollars lost
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama.....	\$69	\$28	\$34	18	9	27	\$6.00	(\$34×39 weeks) — (\$28×27 weeks) = \$570
Alaska.....	131	45+12	65	25	None	25	20.00	(\$65×39 weeks) — (\$45×25 weeks) = 1,410
Arizona.....	83	35	41	19	None	19	6.00	(\$41×39 weeks) — (\$35×19 weeks) = 934
Arkansas.....	58	26	29	16	8	24	3.00	(\$29×39 weeks) — (\$26×24 weeks) = 507
California.....	93	40	46	23	11	34	6.00	(\$46×39 weeks) — (\$40×34 weeks) = 434
Colorado.....	83	35	41	14	7	21	6.00	(\$41×39 weeks) — (\$35×21 weeks) = 864
Connecticut.....	89	40+9	44	21	10	31	4.00	(\$44×39 weeks) — (\$40×31 weeks) = 476
Delaware.....	94	40	47	18	9	27	7.00	(\$47×39 weeks) — (\$40×27 weeks) = 753
District of Columbia.....	80	30	40	19	9	28	10.00	(\$40×39 weeks) — (\$30×28 weeks) = 720
Florida.....	71	30	35	13	None	13	5.00	(\$35×39 weeks) — (\$30×13 weeks) = 975
Georgia.....	65	30	32	20	None	20	2.00	(\$32×39 weeks) — (\$30×20 weeks) = 648
Hawaii.....	65	32	32	20	None	20	0	(\$32×39 weeks) — (\$32×20 weeks) = 608
Illinois.....	75	37	37	16	None	16	0	(\$37×39 weeks) — (\$37×16 weeks) = 851
Indiana.....	94	30+6	47	19	9	28	17.00	(\$47×39 weeks) — (\$30×28 weeks) = 993
Iowa.....	88	33	44	14	7	21	11.00	(\$44×39 weeks) — (\$33×21 weeks) = 1,023
Kansas.....	76	30	38	13	None	13	8.00	(\$38×39 weeks) — (\$30×13 weeks) = 1,092
Kentucky.....	79	34	39	16	None	16	5.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$34×16 weeks) = 977
Louisiana.....	74	34	37	26	None	26	3.00	(\$37×39 weeks) — (\$34×26 weeks) = 559
Maine.....	77	35	38	16	None	16	3.00	(\$38×39 weeks) — (\$35×16 weeks) = 922
Maryland.....	69	33	34	26	None	26	1.00	(\$34×39 weeks) — (\$33×26 weeks) = 468
Massachusetts.....	77	35+4	38	26	13	39	3.00	(\$38×39 weeks) — (\$35×39 weeks) = 117
Michigan.....	78	35+9	39	20	10	30	4.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$35×30 weeks) = 471
Minnesota.....	99	30+6	49	20	10	30	19.00	(\$49×39 weeks) — (\$30×30 weeks) = 1,011
Mississippi.....	81	38	40	23	11	34	2.00	(\$40×39 weeks) — (\$38×34 weeks) = 268
Missouri.....	58	29	29	20	None	20	0	(\$29×39 weeks) — (\$29×20 weeks) = 551
Montana.....	81	33	40	19	None	19	7.00	(\$40×39 weeks) — (\$33×19 weeks) = 933
Nebraska.....	78	\$32	\$39	22	None	22	7.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$32×22 weeks) = \$817
Nevada.....	72	32	36	17	None	17	4.00	(\$36×39 weeks) — (\$32×17 weeks) = 860
New Hampshire.....	91	37.50+11	45	20	10	30	7.50	(\$45×39 weeks) — (\$37.50×30 weeks) = 630
New Jersey.....	69	32	34	26	None	26	2.00	(\$34×39 weeks) — (\$32×26 weeks) = 494
New Mexico.....	91	35	45	22	11	33	10.00	(\$45×39 weeks) — (\$35×33 weeks) = 600
New York.....	78	30	39	19	None	19	9.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$30×19 weeks) = 951
North Carolina.....	91	45	45	26	13	39	0	(\$45×39 weeks) — (\$45×39 weeks) = 0
North Dakota.....	61	30	30	26	None	26	0	(\$30×39 weeks) — (\$30×26 weeks) = 390
Ohio.....	71	26+7	35	20	None	20	9.00	(\$35×39 weeks) — (\$26×20 weeks) = 845
Oklahoma.....	92	33+5	46	24	12	36	13.00	(\$46×39 weeks) — (\$33×24 weeks) = 606
Oregon.....	78	28	39	17	None	17	11.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$28×17 weeks) = 1,045
Pennsylvania.....	84	40	42	21	None	21	2.00	(\$42×39 weeks) — (\$40×21 weeks) = 798
Rhode Island.....	82	35	41	17	15	45	6.00	(\$41×39 weeks) — (\$35×45 weeks) = 24
South Carolina.....	72	30	36	10	8	25	6.00	(\$36×39 weeks) — (\$30×25 weeks) = 654
South Dakota.....	60	26	30	19	None	19	4.00	(\$30×39 weeks) — (\$26×19 weeks) = 676
Tennessee.....	69	28	34	14	None	14	6.00	(\$34×39 weeks) — (\$28×14 weeks) = 934
Texas.....	70	30	35	22	None	22	5.00	(\$35×39 weeks) — (\$30×22 weeks) = 705
Utah.....	78	39	39	16	None	16	11.00	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$39×16 weeks) = 1,073
Vermont.....	78	39	39	21	None	21	0	(\$39×39 weeks) — (\$39×21 weeks) = 702
Virginia.....	69	28	34	14	None	14	7.00	(\$34×39 weeks) — (\$28×14 weeks) = 637
Washington.....	87	35	43	22	None	22	8.00	(\$43×39 weeks) — (\$35×22 weeks) = 934
West Virginia.....	85	30	42	24	12	36	12.00	(\$42×39 weeks) — (\$30×36 weeks) = 907
Wisconsin.....	86	42	43	23	11	34	1.00	(\$43×39 weeks) — (\$42×34 weeks) = 553
Wyoming.....	77	38+5	38	17	None	17	0	(\$38×39 weeks) — (\$38×17 weeks) = 836

¹ Where 2 figures are shown, second figure is average additional amount for beneficiaries receiving dependents' allowances.

² In these cases unemployed workers earning an amount equal to the State's average weekly wage would not have benefited from Federal standards. But unemployed workers earning more than the average would have benefited from Federal standards because their benefit amount under the standard (col. 3) would have been higher than that indicated for the average worker.

As has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], this bill is not offered as an instant cure for the chronic economic chills-and-fever which is weakening our country and our people when we need all our health, all our strength in human and material terms, more than ever before in our history.

A whole kit of measures are urgently needed to put idle men, machines, and money back to work, to get back to full employment and full production, and to see to it that this recovery is accomplished, not on a blind boom-and-bust cyclical swing through inflation and deflation, but on the sound basis of a stable steadily expanding economy and a rising standard of living for all our people.

Enactment of this bill stands high on this list of measures needed to implement the moral commitment made by Congress in enacting the Employment Act of 1946 and in providing funds for its administration.

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that we shall have to provide for some extension of the temporary unemployment compensation bill which is now due to ex-

pire April 1, 1959. Continuance may provide extension of benefits for several thousand unemployed workers and their families who will have exhausted all their rights under State unemployment compensation laws. For example, in Michigan, such exhaustions may amount to 5,000 unemployed workers a week.

But such extension, if made, must not be allowed to become a substitute for action on this substantial and permanent improvement in the entire Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

With all the good will and hard work of which the 86th Congress and the American people are capable in the next 2 years, large-scale unemployment is all too likely to continue to be a major problem.

The steady advance of technology, including automation, the practice of large corporations in the steel, automobile, and other industries in raising prices on the pretext that such increases are required by such wage increases as unions are able to win by collective bargaining all combine to throw the economy out of balance. Within the up-and-down curves of the recurrent boom-and-bust

cycle we now see a steady and stubborn growth in continuing mass unemployment.

In 1 year, from December 1957 to December 1958, automobile production by General Motors and Ford increased by 60,000 units. But, against the 60,000 production gain there was an absolute decline in employment in these 2 corporations by 33,400 workers. Throughout the Nation, employment in the auto industry averaged 620,000 workers in 1958, or 165,000 fewer persons than the average in 1957, and 190,000 fewer than in 1956.

This sickness in our economy, this inability of American farmers and wage earners to buy back fair shares of the potential abundance of foods, fibers, and manufactured goods that they are able to produce in increasing volume year after year, does more than weaken us now. It tends to waste the lives not only of adult Americans of this generation but to blight the lives of the next generation, since the poverty, the insecurity, and the anxiety of the parents tends to mark their children for life.

During the past 20 years, the ceiling payments allowed under State laws have failed to move upward at the same rate as wages. The result in all States, barring none, is that the maximum benefit allowance as a percentage of wage levels is today only a fraction of what it was in 1939.

The median or middle State, in 1939, had a maximum benefit of 65 percent of its average weekly wage.

The median State today has a maximum benefit of only 44 percent of its average weekly wage.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point table VI, showing how benefits have fallen behind wages since 1939.

TABLE VI.—How benefits relative to wages have declined, 1939–58

Maximum benefit amounts expressed as percentage of State's average weekly wages in covered employment	Number of States and Territories	
	1939	1958
95 to 99	3	
90 to 94	1	
85 to 89	4	
80 to 84	2	
75 to 79	2	
70 to 74	6	
65 to 69	10	
60 to 64	7	
55 to 59	10	3
50 to 54	5	4
45 to 49		17
40 to 44	1	14
35 to 39		10
30 to 34		3
Total	51	51

This bill would reestablish the median maximum level of 1939 and it would raise the present maximums in all States to 66½ percent of average weekly wages in each State.

But the dollar amount in each State would be different and would depend on general wage levels. Furthermore, by stating the maximum as a percentage in each State instead of a fixed dollar amount, this bill would prevent any future deterioration in the adequacy of maximum benefit amounts.

The State-by-State downgrading of the maximum benefit amounts can be seen from the following table, which I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point and which is marked as table VII:

TABLE VII.—State maximum benefit amounts relative to wages, 1939, and Oct. 1, 1958

	Maximum weekly benefit as a percentage of average weekly wages	
	1958	1939
Alabama	40	87
Alaska	34	41
Arizona	42	61
Arkansas	45	95
California	43	50
Colorado	42	62
Connecticut	45	56
Delaware	43	58
Washington, D. C.	37	59
Florida	42	81
Georgia	46	87
Hawaii	54	85
Idaho	53	82
Illinois	32	56
Indiana	37	58
Iowa	39	67
Kansas	43	66
Kentucky	46	69

TABLE VII.—State maximum benefit amounts relative to wages, 1939, and Oct. 1, 1958—Continued

	Maximum weekly benefit as a percentage of average weekly wages	
	1958	1939
Louisiana	46	90
Maine	48	74
Maryland	45	65
Massachusetts	45	57
Michigan	30	53
Minnesota	47	62
Mississippi	52	97
Missouri	41	61
Montana	41	60
Nebraska	44	67
Nevada	41	56
New Hampshire	46	70
New Jersey	39	55
New Mexico	38	73
New York	49	51
North Carolina	52	89
North Dakota	37	69
Ohio	36	54
Oklahoma	36	61
Oregon	47	53
Pennsylvania	43	60
Rhode Island	42	70
South Carolina	44	99
South Dakota	41	69
Tennessee	43	78
Texas	36	65
Utah	50	70
Vermont	40	66
Virginia	41	74
Washington	40	57
West Virginia	35	59
Wisconsin	49	55
Wyoming	56	78

It should be clearly understood that there is no intent in this bill to pay high maximums to all claimants or even to most claimants.

In fact, the intent is to do just the opposite. In no case will this bill force State programs to pay to any individual claimant more than half of his individual weekly wage.

The effect of higher maximums is simply to allow this formula of 50 percent of individual benefits to operate over a wider range. The only unemployed who will be entitled to the new maximums are those who make a weekly wage of twice the new maximum benefit amounts. They and everyone making lower weekly earnings would receive in benefits only half of their individual weekly wages. Those wage earners earning more than twice the maximum amounts would be restrained by the maximum to less than half of their weekly wage.

It will be clear by now that the major effect of the benefit provisions of this bill is to restore unemployment insurance as a wage-related program, rather than the fixed-benefit program which it has become in so many States because of low maximum benefit amounts.

The following table, marked table VIII, which under unanimous consent I insert at this point, shows what percentage of claimants State by State now receive the maximum and therefore do not receive one-half of their own individual weekly wage:

TABLE VIII.—Percentage of claimants drawing maximum benefit amount, spring 1958

Alabama	51
Alaska	52
Arizona	61
Arkansas	43
California	40

TABLE VIII.—Percentage of claimants drawing maximum benefit amount, spring 1958—Continued

Colorado	64
Connecticut	43
Delaware	48
District of Columbia	64
Florida	42
Georgia	38
Hawaii	35
Idaho	54
Illinois	82
Indiana	66
Iowa	67
Kansas	61
Kentucky	49
Louisiana	83
Maine	24
Maryland	46
Massachusetts	29
Michigan	86
Minnesota	40
Mississippi	23
Missouri	52
Montana	56
Nebraska	58
Nevada	57
New Hampshire	38
New Jersey	69
New Mexico	62
New York	27
North Carolina	14
North Dakota	75
Ohio	80
Oklahoma	71
Oregon	62
Pennsylvania	55
Rhode Island	63
South Carolina	37
South Dakota	61
Tennessee	36
Texas	62
Utah	58
Vermont	49
Virginia	47
Washington	58
West Virginia	54
Wisconsin	53
Wyoming	52

In the beginning, it was not known what the cost of unemployment insurance would be and the benefit durations were intentionally so low until further information on the cost and experience of duration amounts would be available. Some States liberalized their duration requirements, always provided the unemployed claimant is able and available for work and seeking suitable employment.

There is such great variability in the potential duration of benefits among the different States that we now have a crazy-quilt pattern of varying degrees of inadequacy, as shown by congressional action to help extend the duration of benefits during the current recession.

Florida and Virginia allow no more than 16 and 18 weeks potential duration only to the most fortunate claimants with the average potential duration even less.

Pennsylvania, on the other hand, allows in its regular State unemployment compensation program, 30 weeks potential duration to those who continue to seek work.

The recent experience with duration of benefits and exhaustions is summed up in the following table, which under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD at this point as table IX.

TABLE IX.—Exhaustions of regular State benefits Jan. 1–Sept. 1, 1958

	Number of ex-haustees	Exhaustees as percent of claimants
United States.....	1,745,446	27.8
Alabama.....	39,040	46.5
Alaska.....	3,283	33.8
Arizona.....	5,383	23.8
Arkansas.....	17,411	39.8
California.....	101,651	17.6
Colorado.....	7,617	27.9
Connecticut.....	37,943	29.6
Delaware.....	5,712	33.5
District of Columbia.....	7,141	41.1
Florida.....	33,721	44.8
Georgia.....	36,672	36.3
Hawaii.....	1,856	18.7
Idaho.....	6,433	33.5
Illinois.....	102,770	29.4
Indiana.....	59,970	44.7
Iowa.....	13,538	34.4
Kansas.....	13,386	30.6
Kentucky.....	26,496	30.0
Louisiana.....	19,178	40.4
Maine.....	4,917	10.8
Maryland.....	24,653	23.5
Massachusetts.....	64,737	26.1
Michigan.....	165,972	36.2
Minnesota.....	23,350	27.8
Mississippi.....	15,195	35.0
Missouri.....	27,341	21.3
Montana.....	8,641	32.3
Nebraska.....	6,785	33.8
Nevada.....	4,108	28.2
New Hampshire.....	1,439	8.4
New Jersey.....	97,883	33.0
New Mexico.....	3,729	26.8
New York.....	138,257	18.0
North Carolina.....	31,688	19.6
North Dakota.....	1,492	24.1
Ohio.....	94,178	25.1
Oklahoma.....	17,385	37.7
Oregon.....	24,236	29.0
Pennsylvania.....	119,930	21.0
Rhode Island.....	22,191	38.2
South Carolina.....	17,563	35.8
South Dakota.....	2,312	36.3
Tennessee.....	43,976	42.7
Texas.....	63,415	38.6
Utah.....	4,667	23.3
Vermont.....	2,705	23.7
Virginia.....	34,750	45.4
Washington.....	33,859	26.7
West Virginia.....	22,264	23.5
Wisconsin.....	49,806	42.6
Wyoming.....	2,074	27.3

One result of the gradual change of unemployment compensation from a wage-related to a flat-benefit program has been steady reduction in the cost of the program to far below its originally intended cost. Whether the average costs are expressed as percentages of the taxable wage base or of the total wage base, this change is significant and dramatic. The wage base in most States is the first \$3,000 of earnings, which used to be most of payrolls but is now only 65 to 70 percent of payrolls. So the more accurate indication of the gradual cheapening of unemployment insurance is the average employer tax as a percentage of total wages, as shown in the following table, marked "Table X," which, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE X.—Average employer contribution rate expressed as a percent of taxable wages and of total wages, 1938–57

Year	Rate as percent of taxable wages, all States	Rate as percent of total wages, all States
1938.....	2.75	2.69
1939.....	2.72	2.66
1940.....	2.69	2.50
1941.....	2.58	2.37
1942.....	2.19	1.98

TABLE X.—Average employer contribution rate expressed as a percent of taxable wages and of total wages, 1938–57—Con.

Year	Rate as percent of taxable wages, all States	Rate as percent of total wages, all States
1943.....	2.09	1.86
1944.....	1.92	1.67
1945.....	1.71	1.50
1946.....	1.43	1.24
1947.....	1.41	1.19
1948.....	1.24	1.01
1949.....	1.31	1.07
1950.....	1.50	1.18
1951.....	1.58	1.20
1952.....	1.45	1.08
1953.....	1.30	.93
1954.....	1.12	.79
1955.....	1.18	.81
1956.....	1.32	.88
1957.....	1.31	.85
1958.....	1.4	.9

It should, of course, be understood that the cost of unemployment insurance at present levels varies greatly as between States, depending on the economy of the State and the impact of slumps on the industries of a particular State.

In general, however, the cost of the program has been low enough that most States have stayed within the original tax limits set under Federal law.

The following table, table XI, which under unanimous consent I ask to insert in the RECORD at this point, shows the average tax rates State by State for 1957 and 1958:

TABLE XI.—Average employer contribution rate, by State, 1957–58 (rates expressed as percent of taxable wages)

State	1957 (actual)	1958 (estimated)
United States.....	1.31	1.4
Alabama.....	1.03	1
Alaska.....	2.70	2.7
Arizona.....	1.33	1.3
Arkansas.....	1.14	1.1
California.....	1.34	1.4
Colorado.....	.68	.6
Connecticut.....	1.19	1.2
Delaware.....	.65	.7
District of Columbia.....	.71	.7
Florida.....	.64	.8
Georgia.....	1.22	1.2
Hawaii.....	1.02	1.0
Idaho.....	1.34	1.3
Illinois.....	1	.8
Indiana.....	1.02	1.1
Iowa.....	.70	.8
Kansas.....	1.08	1.1
Kentucky.....	1.95	2.0
Louisiana.....	1.43	1.1
Maine.....	1.58	1.6
Maryland.....	1	1.1
Massachusetts.....	1.55	1.7
Michigan.....	2.04	2.3
Minnesota.....	.68	.8
Mississippi.....	1.65	1.6
Missouri.....	.98	1.0
Montana.....	1.22	1.3
Nebraska.....	.95	.8
Nevada.....	1.98	2.2
New Hampshire.....	1.58	1.6
New Jersey.....	1.73	1.9
New Mexico.....	1.17	1.2
New York.....	1.77	1.6
North Carolina.....	1.45	1.5
North Dakota.....	1.51	1.3
Ohio.....	.72	.7
Oklahoma.....	.79	.9
Oregon.....	1.43	2.5
Pennsylvania.....	1.55	2.1
Rhode Island.....	2.70	2.7
South Carolina.....	1.18	1.2
South Dakota.....	.96	1.0
Tennessee.....	1.75	1.8
Texas.....	.63	.6

TABLE XI.—Average employer contribution rate, by State, 1957–58 (rates expressed as percent of taxable wages)—Continued

State	1957 (actual)	1958 (estimated)
Utah.....	1.31	1.3
Vermont.....	1.32	1.2
Virginia.....	.53	.4
Washington.....	2.11	2.7
West Virginia.....	1.14	1.2
Wisconsin.....	1.10	1.1
Wyoming.....	1.12	1.1

These figures do not represent the actual cost of benefits paid out, but rather the average tax rate that each particular State has deemed desirable, given the reserves and experience in recent years. In other words, it is an approximation of the longrun cost of the program in each State as affected by reserve requirements.

During our hearings on Federal standards last year, the Bureau of Employment Security estimated the cost of the benefit standards in this bill as about 50 percent more than the cost of the present unemployment compensation program.

Raising the tax rates 50 percent more than those in existence in the last 2 years still would leave unemployment insurance in nearly all States running less than the 2.7 percent maximum still in the Federal law.

In those circumstances where the cost of benefits is running over 2 percent in a particular State at a particular time, this bill provides for reinsurance grants to be paid in an amount of three-fourths of 1 percent of that cost over 2 percent of taxable payrolls.

Any State with adequate financing and low reserves would be eligible for this reinsurance grant, which would be paid from the three-tenths of 1 percent of taxable payroll that now goes for administrative costs and reinsurance loans.

In talking about average tax rates in each State, we should not forget that experience rating, which is not a Federal requirement for offsets from the 2.7 percent of taxable payrolls, operates to produce different rates for each employer.

To those who object to Federal standards we should point out that experience rating is a Federal standard in a negative sense of permitting States to cut tax rates after cutting benefits below 50 percent of wages. In other words, we have in the present law a strong negative financing standard but no benefit standards.

The effect of experience rating on the tax rates in each State is indicated in the following table, table XII, which shows how many companies are in different tax categories.

It is significant to note that, in 13 States, experience rating has been carried so far as to exempt many employers. In one case, 94 percent of all employers eligible for rate modification are at a zero rate. In other words, they pay nothing toward the cost of unemployment insurance.

ance benefits. These employers pay only the three-tenths of 1 percent administrative costs to the U.S. Treasury. It

should also be noted that a large proportion of all employers in many States pay taxes amounting to less than 1 per-

cent of taxable payrolls. Under unanimous consent I insert the following table in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE XII.—Percentage distribution of active accounts eligible for rate modification, by contribution rate, and type of experience-rating plan, rate years beginning in 1957

Type of plan and State ¹	Total number of active accounts ²	Active accounts eligible for rate modification							
		Number	Percent of all active accounts	Percentage distribution by employer contribution rate					
				Below standard rate				At stand-ard rate	Above standard rate
				0	0.1-0.9	1.0-1.8	1.9-2.6		
Total, 49 States ³	1,900,274	1,300,025	68.6	6.0	43.4	21.6	11.6	12.7	4.6
Reserve-ratio plan	1,195,201	833,228	69.7	8.7	41.2	23.2	7.4	16.8	2.7
Arizona ^{4,5}	11,539	7,809	66.5		53.5	34.3	5.2	7.0	
Arkansas ⁶	30,550	21,496	70.4		70.1	15.6	8.1	6.3	
California	262,662	166,353	63.3	21.2	29.1	19.8	8.8	21.0	
Colorado ⁷	13,135	6,336	48.2	94.4	2.9			2.7	
District of Columbia	18,677	14,725	78.8		78.9	8.4	1.6	11.2	
Georgia ⁸	25,866	14,080	54.4		48.8	30.0	14.3	7.0	
Hawaii ⁹	8,839	7,507	84.9	52.7	17.7	7.9	2.3	19.4	
Idaho	13,182	9,504	72.1		54.6	20.4	21.2	3.8	
Indiana ¹⁰	32,410	15,667	48.3		67.4	20.6	3.8	8.1	
Iowa ¹¹	19,753	9,887	50.1	50.5	41.1			8.3	
Kansas	15,600	8,641	55.4	8.1	74.7	9.6	2.0	5.7	
Kentucky ¹²	19,727	16,411	83.2	19.2	16.4	12.7		41.6	10.1
Louisiana	23,094	16,745	72.5		56.2	17.4	5.7	20.7	
Maine ¹³	8,298	4,054	48.9		43.4	39.3	5.6	11.7	
Massachusetts	103,736	95,991	92.5		36.2	18.4	12.6	32.8	
Michigan ¹⁴	46,832	26,327	56.2			69.2	10.0		20.8
Missouri ¹⁵	32,163	16,586	51.6	28.2	41.9	20.6	4.1		5.2
Nebraska ¹⁶	10,896	6,289	57.7		76.4	11.1	3.3	9.2	
Nevada	5,835	3,471	59.5		30.7	42.1	11.6	15.6	
New Hampshire	6,188	5,507	89.0		47.3	12.2	19.8	20.8	
New Jersey ¹⁷	53,191	39,765	74.8		29.0	23.5	10.7	12.2	24.6
New Mexico	14,336	9,259	64.6		77.2	13.0	2.9	6.9	
North Carolina ¹⁸	24,410	14,458	59.2		52.4	26.4	11.5	9.7	
North Dakota ¹⁹	4,596	2,631	57.2		50.4	24.1	7.3	18.3	
Ohio ²⁰	90,591	68,271	75.4		74.3	14.9	1.2	9.6	
Oregon ²¹	25,015	15,059	60.2		44.6	27.2	10.0	7.0	11.2
Pennsylvania ²²	195,418	162,859	83.3		42.2	32.3	5.0	20.5	
South Carolina ²³	11,255	6,441	57.2		57.8	18.3	9.7	14.2	
South Dakota ²⁴	4,971	2,273	45.7	78.4	11.3	4.6	2.2	3.5	
Tennessee	21,155	10,495	49.6		31.1	40.5	9.9	8.9	9.6
West Virginia ²⁵	10,986	5,683	51.7	42.9	20.6	12.6	6.6	17.3	
Wisconsin ²⁶	29,995	22,588	75.3	43.6	15.5	23.9	9.2		7.8
Benefit-wage ratio plan	215,022	141,944	66.0		74.4	13.2	4.4	3.0	5.0
Alabama ²⁷	19,553	10,086	51.6		70.3	19.0	4.5	6.2	
Delaware	8,299	5,895	71.0		88.5	6.8	2.0	(*)	2.6
Illinois	81,534	56,493	69.3		64.5	17.4	5.9		12.2
Oklahoma	16,657	10,124	60.8		64.9	11.8	8.5	14.9	
Texas ²⁸	65,461	37,700	57.6		81.5	11.1	3.1	4.3	
Virginia	23,518	21,646	92.0		90.2	5.9	1.5	2.4	
Benefit-ratio plan	132,131	92,221	69.8	6.4	73.9	5.7	2.1	11.9	
Florida ²⁹	35,020	18,317	52.3	32.4	54.2	5.8	1.3	6.4	
Maryland	45,672	33,691	73.8		81.0	7.8	2.9	8.3	
Minnesota ³⁰	39,180	32,080	81.9		79.2	1.3	1.0	18.6	
Vermont	3,583	2,176	60.7		58.5	24.9	7.0	9.6	
Wyoming	8,676	5,957	68.7		71.6	10.0	3.7	14.7	
Payroll variation plan ³¹	87,672	69,779	79.6			27.0	68.2	4.7	
Mississippi	11,483	9,483	82.6			89.9	9.7	.3	
Rhode Island ³²	17,245	11,282	65.4			91.7	6.5	1.8	
Utah	58,944	49,014	83.2				93.7	6.3	
Washington ³³									
Compensable-separation plan	28,476	23,042	80.9		57.6	33.0		9.3	
Connecticut	28,476	23,042	80.9		57.6	33.0		9.3	
Payroll variation and reserve ratio	234,764	137,438	58.5		22.7	26.8		2.7	
New York	234,764	137,438	58.5		22.7	26.8	25.0	2.7	22.9
Payroll variation and benefit ratio plan	16,008	11,373	71.0		59.6	18.3	2.8	19.3	
Montana	16,008	11,373	71.0		59.6	18.3	2.8	19.3	

¹ Classified by type of plan in effect at end of 1957.

² All rated and unrated accounts; excludes accounts newly subject after State cutoff dates for preparation of reports.

³ National totals and totals for payroll variation plan exclude data for Rhode Island, which did not assign employers any reduced rates for 1957 rate year. National totals also exclude data for Alaska, which repealed experience rating provision as of Jan. 1, 1955.

⁴ For Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Texas, data exclude newly qualified employers assigned reduced rates after computation date.

⁵ Includes effects of voluntary contributions made toward credit for 1957 rates.

⁶ Less than 0.05 percent.

⁷ When reduced rates are assigned in Washington, the rate variations are achieved through the use of tax credit offsets. Employer accounts in this State are classified by rate for current rate year on the assumption that each employer's taxable payroll would remain the same as in the preceding year.

In general, we must conclude that unemployment insurance is a cheaper program than was intended. The average national rate of only 1.4 percent of taxable payrolls or nine-tenths of 1 percent

of taxable payrolls is only 2 cents per hour or considerably less than the cost of their fringe items that up-to-date employers include in employee compensation.

This bill would allow States greater freedom in the financing of their programs. A number of States have had difficulty with the operation of experience or merit rating and would like more

latitude. This bill would allow a State to establish uniform rate reductions, if it so wished.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we who believe that enactment of this bill is not only a matter of social justice but also a wise action to strengthen our economy for the long hard pull ahead, are of the opinion that we cannot afford the costs to our society and to our economy of a cheap program of unemployment compensation. We cannot afford benefit amounts so inadequate in amount and duration that they must be supplemented and followed by relief payments. We cannot afford such damage to the families of workers able and willing to work but unemployed through no fault of their own. We cannot afford such sags in purchasing power and the volume of business in our local communities, our State, and the Nation as a whole. We cannot afford the backing up of inventories, the layoffs, the unpaid bills, the evictions, the empty houses, stores, and offices that flow in evil sequence from such contraction of workers' incomes and that can be retarded by more nearly adequate unemployment compensation benefits. By acting together in this Congress, as the Constitution intended, we can do together what no one of us, no one State, can afford to do separately. We can afford to be humanly decent to our fellow men; we can afford to be economically wise. Thereby we can serve our country well in this sector of what must be a broad effort to implement the Employment Act of 1946.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FEDERAL STANDARDS BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join with a number of my distinguished colleagues in presenting an unemployment compensation Federal standards bill to extend and improve our present Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

Although our Nation's economy and industrial output has achieved prerecession levels, there are still many breadwinners and heads of families who for reasons beyond their control are still without jobs and without any form of sustenance.

Some of these have exhausted their regular unemployment compensation benefits; others have exhausted the benefits for the extended 13-week period under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act passed last spring; still others have received no unemployment compensation at all because they were not covered or were determined to be ineligible under the unreasonable terms and conditions for eligibility imposed by the States in which they live.

As the program now operates, benefits range all the way from \$7 a week in some States to \$70 as in the new State of

Alaska and the period for jobless payments runs the gamut from as little as 5 weeks to 45 weekly payments, while only one out of every four persons employed today are not covered at all.

The enactment of Federal minimum standards both with respect to the amount and duration of unemployment compensation payments is long overdue and I earnestly trust that the bipartisan sponsorship of this measure bespeaks the prudence as well as the urgency of immediate favorable consideration.

FLOOD DAMAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cook] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, last week I toured the flooded areas of my district, the 11th Ohio District, and wish to report my observations to the Members of the House.

As I toured stricken areas I was amazed at the extent of the flood damage. Each of the five counties in my district was damaged by last week's heavy rains and resulting floodwaters. Several of the counties suffered primarily from an excess of water which led to flooding in their streets and in the basements of their homes, but in the remaining three counties, similar conditions were worsened by rivers, in each of the counties, overflowing their banks and causing tremendous damage to the surrounding countryside and, in one instance, the loss of five lives.

In western Lake County the Chagrin River overflowed its banks from Willoughby Hills, through Willoughby, to the river's mouth at Eastlake. As a result, five died as hundreds were forced to leave their homes. Damage will run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

In Trumbull County the residents along the Mahoning River suffered the worst flood since 1913. Damage in that county alone has been estimated as high as \$10 million. Before the Mahoning River subsided to below flood level, 2,500 people had been evacuated from their homes.

Also, in Lake County and in the neighboring counties of Ashtabula and Trumbull, the Grand River left its banks and caused great damage in Painesville and Madison in Lake County, Windsor, and Orwell in Ashtabula County, and Bloomfield Township in northern Trumbull County. Once again, hundreds of families were forced to evacuate their homes and great property damage resulted to these communities.

As I toured the flood areas I heard over and over again of the wonderful and heroic job done by thousands of workers, some Government employees but most of them volunteers, as they evacuated flood victims from their homes and furnished them with the necessities of life until such time as they could return to their family homes once again. All of these groups deserve public commendation for their fine work in a true emergency.

I especially call to the attention of the House the fact that two members of the civil defense unit of Lake County, Hamilton Schwitzer and Raymond Kifer, lost their lives in the floodwaters of the Chagrin River, seeking to save others from that same fate.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article from the Painesville Telegraph of Friday, January 23, 1959:

THEY GAVE THEIR LIVES HELPING OTHERS

We pay tribute to the memories of the two men who gave their lives in an attempt to save three other persons from the swirling, raging waters of the Chagrin River.

These men, Raymond Kifer and Hamilton Schwitzer, both civil defense volunteers of Willoughby Hills, made heroic efforts to help their friends in time of danger.

When the boat they and a family of three were in capsized, all five were swept to death in the ice-clogged swollen stream. Witnesses told of the victims clinging to branches and logs for 20 long minutes before the bitter cold became too much and all five were washed away.

There were other acts of heroism as scores of volunteers helped rescue hundreds of persons along the Chagrin River that dark Wednesday night. But the bravery and courage of these two men will go down in Lake County history.

Also, as I toured flood areas in the city of Warren, I heard much praise for Lake Milton and Berlin Dam Reservoirs and the great help they had been in preventing even greater damage from flooding Mahoning River. The Mosquito Reservoir was also credited with having lessened floodwaters for Youngstown and surrounding areas.

In this time of emergency the facilities already installed for flood control in this area of northeastern Ohio demonstrated their value as they held back billions of gallons of water which would have made conditions much worse.

But the present facilities are not adequate to deal with the flood problem in northeast Ohio. Further action must be taken to prevent such floods as occurred last week. While eventual construction of the West Branch Reservoir will provide additional controls on the Mahoning River, flood control programs should be initiated to harness the Chagrin and Grand Rivers. Otherwise, these rivers will cause great damage over and over again in the future.

I respectfully call upon the Congress to give favorable consideration to necessary measures to control such flood conditions in northern Ohio and elsewhere. Money spent for this purpose will be returned many-fold in the years to come by the saving of human life and the elimination of property damage caused by floods.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cook] for painting a very sad and very graphic picture of the flood disaster in his district. I assure the gentleman I appreciate the difficulties suffered by his people. I have a deep feeling for them, and I know that every Member of this House joins me in that feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cook] for yielding the floor to me today in order that I might say a word concerning the worst calamity that has befallen the good people of my congressional district in many decades. It is my privilege to represent the 17th Ohio District, which includes the counties of Ashland, Holmes, Richland, Knox, Coshocton, Delaware, and Licking. The counties and towns within the district which suffered most in this disaster are Newark, Mount Vernon, Mansfield, Shelby, Bellville, Butler, Delaware, Fredericktown, Utica, and St. Louisville.

I am, of course, referring to the flash flood in Ohio on Wednesday, January 21, which came about as the result of heavy concentration of snow and rain on frozen ground.

I want to say a word on why this catastrophe occurred, how it could have been avoided, and also a word, now that it has happened, on what is presently being done to restore order to rehabilitate the people involved and to minimize human suffering to the greatest possible extent, and, Mr. Speaker, what is even more important, what I trust will be done in the future to forever insure against the recurrence of such a calamity.

On Thursday last I made a personal inspection of the area most heavily devastated by this onslaught of water. Nature is usually no respecter of persons but I most regretfully report that in this instance, certainly in the Mount Vernon area, the flood hit those individuals hardest who could least afford to be hit at all. In Licking County alone, of which Newark is the county seat, two human lives were lost and many sustained major injuries. At least 1,300 homes were damaged with 26 destroyed completely. I am told that damages in dollars and cents will amount to more than \$10 million. The American Red Cross, which incidentally along with civil defense workers, National Guard, and countless individuals has rendered heroic service throughout the area I visited, reports that more than 1,500 families in Newark were affected; that this agency fed some 6,000 people, including 1,000 emergency workers.

In Knox County more than 1,000 families suffered heavily from the impact of the flood; at Mount Vernon raging waters flowed over and through the dikes of the Koskosing River and flooded approximately one-third of the city necessitating evacuation of some 3,500 persons to emergency shelters. Damages to the local Continental Can Co. is estimated at more than half a million dollars. Red Cross disaster costs, I am told, will exceed \$175,000. The school officials advise flood damage to public school property will total \$73,000.

This flood has added to the grief of hundreds of families in the west and south end of Mount Vernon already in distress by reason of unemployment occasioned by a strike at the local Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. plant dating back to October of last year.

Mr. Speaker, I saw homes which had been built on weekends over a period of years by those who could not afford to

hire a carpenter, wiped out in a matter of minutes. It was the worst spectacle of devastation I have ever witnessed outside a theater of war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad story but the real tragedy lies in the fact that it could have been averted.

The hard fact is that it should not have happened.

The grief of the disaster in Mount Vernon could have been avoided had we been able to contain the waters of the Koskosing for a matter of some 2 hours. For more than 10 years interested citizens of the Mount Vernon area, including Fredericktown, and involving city and county officials, have tried to get the Federal Government to conduct a flood-control survey of the Koskosing River and its tributaries. In 1956 it was learned that funds had been appropriated by the Congress to enable the Corps of Engineers to make this survey, and while we know that such a survey has been in the works, while it is clear that the Army Engineers have been apprised of the need of flood-control measures in this area, I regret to say that not even a report of the survey has been made to this date.

Now it goes without saying the people in my district, whom I have the honor to represent, have been for years and are still wondering why.

Although I have been advised by the Corps of Engineers that a survey report is forthcoming and that recommended operations will be instituted at the earliest possible date, the situation requires action now. At this time in midwinter, the disaster I have just referred to could well be repeated from even a slight rainfall.

I trust further the Army Engineers will promptly complete the study on the advisability of flood-control work on the Black Fort of the Mohican River which was scheduled for completion in June 1957, more than 2 years ago. Improvement of this stream would have prevented extensive damage to the city of Shelby in Richland County.

To paraphrase a statement of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], I say with all the resources of the United States and with all of the engineering skill that we possess, there is no reason why the people of this area should suffer recurring inundation and hardship.

A happy note to add in this report is that Coshocton County had comparatively little damage during this flood and this was due primarily to the existence of the Mohawk Dam constructed upstream in the Muskingum Conservancy District, a true monument to men of vision and a real example of sound economy in terms of life, limb, and property.

Mr. Speaker, before leaving Washington last Thursday I contacted the White House and the Washington Office of Small Business Administration anticipating that many of my people would be interested in direct relief and disaster loans for rehabilitation and reconstruction purposes. I was advised at that time by the Deputy Administrator, Mr. Albert C. Kelly that officials of the regional office in Cleveland would without

delay make the necessary preliminary survey, estimate the amount of damage and the extent of need. He also stated that temporary arrangements for office space would be made in the district wherever necessary and that following this, as fast as the needs developed, as many people as were required to process applications would be sent into the respective areas to carry on the work.

I was pleased when the Deputy Administrator told me that applications for the disaster loans could be approved in the field offices and with emphasis upon the fact that time is of the essence. I am sure there are many in my district who are anxiously waiting to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them by the law administered by Small Business Administration to gain a new lease on life and become readjusted and productive citizens at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has brought to the attention of the House a very important matter today, the floods that have occurred in the State of Ohio. In Stark County I think we have had about \$20 million of damage. Tuscarawas County has had \$5 million, and we had some damage in Wayne County.

I hope that the gentleman and his colleagues on his side of the aisle will join with us on my side of the aisle in doing everything possible to prevent future catastrophes of this kind. I hope we will give careful consideration to a continuation and proposed enlargement of the Muskingum Conservancy District. I am very proud of the Muskingum Conservancy District which headquarters in my congressional district, for over the years they have been building these control dams, and I think if it had not been for the Muskingum Conservancy District the damage and loss in Ohio would have been millions, and millions, and millions of dollars more than it is today.

I should like to point out that in the Muskingum Conservancy District there are great lakes so fine for recreational purposes in summer, an area where forests are now growing and we have a productive and profitable forestry service. But note this, even the lakes, the ground under the lakes, that forms the bed of the lakes, pays taxes. It is not a typical flood control operation such as we hear so much about in the House of Representatives, but the entire conservancy district pays taxes back to the people of Ohio the same as though the ground were actually being used for farming purposes.

I hope that in our consideration of this matter in trying to do something we will be careful we do not bypass the conservancy district program which has proven so well. Those of you who have served in the State legislatures deserve much credit for the building up of that conservancy district in the State of Ohio. You have the same thing in the Miami Conservancy District. We join with you gentlemen in hoping that something will be done.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has suffered serious damage in his district. Only a few weeks ago, as a gentleman said here the other day, the Army Engineers in passing upon a report for him said that no flood could occur in his district for at least a hundred years. At this time his plants and industries have been flooded out and the damage is perhaps not able to be figured out as yet.

We had the same controversy here in the last few years about Dillon Dam. Finally, through the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] the Dillon Dam has been authorized. It is going to go forward and it will be part of the conservancy district there. I feel that if the Dillon Dam had been built, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEVERING] would have saved some of the loss he had.

So this is a matter, I think, we should all join in, particularly having in mind the conservancy districts where the whole burden is not put on the Federal Government and where we join with the State in cooperation with the Engineers and with the conservancy district to go forward and make sure that in your districts and in mine these things will not be repeated.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his remarks.

I might add the same applies to the west branch of the Mahoning Reservoir. If we could have had that years ago we would have avoided a tremendous amount of damage in the city of Warren.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to thank the gentleman from the 11th District of Ohio [Mr. Cook] for calling the attention of Congress to the extensive flood damage in Ohio, which suffered a great loss of life and property damage. Although my district is among those communities in Ohio which suffered no flood damage, we are concerned with the problems of our fellow citizens. In these days the loss of life and property is inexcusable and unnecessary as far as flood damage is concerned. Flood damage and the resultant loss in life and property are the proximate result of inadequate public expenditures to control and hold back threatening floodwaters. Pennypinching in flood control programs has resulted in irreparable loss of life and property.

In my State of Ohio there are strong and powerful groups which have opposed broad-scale Federal programs. They disregard the fact that over 273 millions of Federal dollars have been spent in Ohio for flood control and navigation aids, as follows:

Up to the year 1948, \$183 million have been spent.

Between 1948 and 1955, \$63,396,000 have been spent.

In the year 1956, \$9,614,000 have been spent.

In 1957, \$16,450,000 have been spent.

And a comparable amount for the year 1958.

The total estimated cost of all presently authorized Federal flood control work in Ohio totals \$417,501,600. The estimated cost of completing these approved projects will require appropriations totaling \$333,851,000 at current price levels. If this work must be eventually done to make Ohio a flood-free State, the problem should be realistically faced without further delay.

I am certain that the millions of Federal dollars that have been spent in Ohio for the control of floods have saved at least 10 times their total in property damage alone, not counting the many lives that have also been saved.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, as we study our current budgetary problems we must dedicate our efforts to the elimination of waste; but we must also exercise proper care and caution to avoid short term savings in Federal expenditures at the expense of long term losses.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cook], that the people of northeast Iowa, myself included, and the people of all Iowa, sympathize greatly with the tragedy that has happened in Ohio. We have had our floods too, very tragic, in recent months, that have caused a considerable loss of life and a considerable loss of property.

I commend the gentleman for his presentation and his proposal, and I am sure that it will receive very serious study by this Congress.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing to the attention of Congress this situation. Year in and year out we are faced with the same problems in flood control. Year after year the Army Engineers are confronted with not having enough money to take care of the many worthwhile flood-control projects. We are "pennywise and dollar foolish." The Engineers should be given adequate funds to carry on with the necessary flood-control program that is so badly needed. In my district last week we suffered a million and a half dollars damage. The Army Engineers have been most cooperative and helpful but because of lack of funds they can only do so much. I hope this Congress will be more generous in this connection. It is my hope that we can get another omnibus flood control bill through both Houses and get a Presidential signature.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOK. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say that it came to my attention the other day from one of the committees of the Con-

gress that it has been estimated—and this not flood control but reclamation, which we consider somewhat in the same category—that since the adoption of the Marshall plan for foreign aid there has been more money spent on reclamation abroad under those plans, good American taxpayers' dollars, than has been spent in the United States since the founding of the Republic. Now, it seems to me that it is about time we began to think about some of these things here in the United States. I join the gentleman in the hope that in connection with projects which have to do with the protection of our own people that we see to it that there is adequate money, even though we take it away from foreign aid funds, which I have tried to do for many years. But, it seems to me that this is something that we should consider when we think of the fact that more money is spent on reclamation in foreign aid funds, since the Marshall plan, than has been spent on reclamation in this country since the founding of the Republic. I hope this, too, as the gentleman said he hopes, that we get a good flood control bill, a bill that will receive a Presidential signature. And, I hope that when the Congress passes a bill, it passes a bill based upon the needs of the people, and for proper flood control, and take care of the people, and that we do not put in so many things that are not necessary simply to try to satisfy people in various districts and that we confine it to the needs and the benefits of the people rather than the possible political expediency of individuals. In that way we will get a Presidential signature for the needs of the people.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. May I say, first of all, in connection with loss of lives and property damage year in and year out, that the Congressmen in the districts where these projects are under consideration certainly know their districts and know what their districts need. "Pork barreling," as far as I am concerned, is an election word used by some individuals. I am not in agreement with any individual who tries to help himself or alleviate himself politically. I am interested first of all in saving lives and saving property and not for benefits affecting a certain individual.

Mr. COOK. I thank the gentleman.

DEFENSE FACILITIES PROTECTION ACT OF 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COAD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which, if eventually passed, will be known as the Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959. A similar bill was introduced by Senator BUTLER in 1957. The bill would authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to Communist acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion.

As stated in the bill:

The history of modern warfare has established that the defense of any country is greatly dependent upon the effective and continued operation of its industrial economy and the full utilization of its productive capabilities. In time of war or of preparation for defense from attack by a potential aggressor, injury to the industrial economy or impairment of the productive capabilities of a country may severely curtail its military effectiveness, and such injury or impairment has become a major objective of aggressor nations in their preparation for and prosecution of war.

The Department of Defense for a number of years has urged the adoption of legislation by the Congress as proposed in my bill.

Mr. Tyler Port, Director of the Office of Security Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and four other officials from the Department of Defense, testified before our Committee on Un-American Activities in behalf of this legislation. Their testimony and the testimony of numerous other witnesses indicating the necessity of this legislation to protect the internal security of this Nation, particularly in communications facilities, appear in the printed hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities. The publications of the committee of these hearings are entitled "Investigation of Communist Penetration of Communications Facilities, Part 1 and Part 2."

The chief purpose of the hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this field of Communist access to defense facilities was to test the adequacy of existing law in furtherance of the duty of the committee to maintain a continuous watchfulness over internal security laws. The testimony of all of the witnesses from the Pentagon and the communications industry was to the effect that notwithstanding Communist access to defense facilities, there is no violation of the present law.

Here, for example, is an excerpt of the testimony given before the committee several months ago by A. Tyler Port, Director of the Office of Security Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense:

Mr. ARENS. Is the record clear, gentlemen, that the Defense Establishment is of the judgment that present law is inadequate to cope with the problem of Communists and their access to the vital communications facilities of the Defense Department?

Mr. PORT. That is correct, Mr. Arens. I might say, if I may, that as the speed, range, and complexity of our modern weapons systems advance, our communications system on a global basis become increasingly vital to modern military operations.

Here are some further excerpts from the testimony, Mr. Speaker:

Paul Goldsborough, staff director, Communications Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—testified that there is a potential possibility of sabotage of communications facilities which process defense messages by any "subversive element that might be so minded."

Michael Mignon, a representative of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, testified that he had formerly been a member of the Communist Party of the United States. Mr. Mignon

pointed out the importance that the Communist Party places upon control of the communications industry in times of emergency. He stated:

To the best of my recollection, sir, it was always pointed out to me that the importance of obtaining control of the communications industry in times of stress or in revolutionary times was a primary factor, and therefore the efforts of the Communist Party in subsidizing the union and offering whatever assistance they could in building the union in the communications industry was primarily the main objective.

Mark Anthony Solga, employed as a radio operator by the Radio Corp. of America, testified before the committee that he had also been a member of the Communist Party. When asked whether he believed that the employment of Communists in the communications industry constituted a serious menace to the security of the United States, Mr. Solga stated:

Potentially, I honestly believe that it does. In the event of any further conflict between the East and West, as that tension increases during the so-called cold war, if it should ultimately develop to a stage where it becomes rather hot, then I do honestly believe they are in a potentially dangerous position to inflict harm on our national security.

Samuel Rothbaum, who is employed as an assistant repeater chief by the Western Union Telegraph Co., testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party and that, in his opinion, based upon 22 years of experience in the communications industry, a saboteur could inflict "an awful lot of damage" in time of crisis.

Mrs. Concetta Padovani Greenberg, who has been employed by the Western Union Telegraph Co. since 1927, also appeared as a friendly witness during the course of the hearings. She testified that she had been a member of the Communist Party for a period of years. When questioned regarding the possibility of access to confidential and coded messages by members of the Communist Party, Mrs. Greenberg testified that persons known to her as having been members of the Communist Party do have access to confidential messages transmitted over facilities of certain segments of the communications industry. She stated that she has seen confidential messages relating to the tests made upon the atomic and hydrogen bombs.

In order to complete the record, may I insert here other testimony on this subject taken in the past before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. May I say that the reason Mr. Arens' name appears in both the hearings of the House and of the Senate is that until about 2 years ago when he became staff director of the Committee on Un-American Activities, he was staff director of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

In 1951 the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate conducted a series of hearings respecting subversive infiltration in the telegraph industry. Here are excerpts from the testimony in those hearings:

Mr. ARENS. Do the defense departments of the United States Government lease any

wires from Western Union which go through New York?

Mr. MITCHELL. They do.

Mr. ARENS. Do the other departments of the Government of the United States, which deal with problems of defense and defense production, lease wires which go through New York?

Mr. MITCHELL. They do.

Mr. ARENS. Those are leased from the Western Union Co.?

Mr. SHUTE. Some of them.

Mr. ARENS. Are the messages which go over those wires subject to monitoring by ACA people?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes, they are.

Mr. ARENS. Then am I clear in our interpretation of what you are saying that information which is transmitted by the defense facilities of this Government is available to the monitoring process or otherwise to the employees represented by the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Is that information on the leased wires available to the stewards who are appointed by the officials of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. It is possible; yes.

Mr. ARENS. Why do you qualify it as being possible?

Mr. WILCOX. In the sense that it may not be always the steward that is monitoring that particular circuit, but if he did, why, of course, it would be available to him.

Mr. SHUTE. Not all stewards have access to monitoring facilities.

Mr. WILCOX. It is only the particular stewards who might represent the technicians in that particular section of the industry.

Mr. WATERS. But the opportunity is there.

Mr. WILCOX. But the opportunity is there.

Mr. ARENS. May I ask this question here, to pose a hypothetical case. Let us assume that an official in the Pentagon, who is concerned with the armament problems of a North Atlantic Pact nation, sends a cable over a leased wire from Washington by New York on to the Atlantic Pact nation respecting armament problems; would that cable or the information contained therein be subject to monitoring in New York by a person who is a member of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. ARENS. What is your appraisal of that, as a man who has had vast experience in the communications field, from the standpoint of the security interest of this Nation?

Mr. WILCOX. I think it is extremely hazardous.

Mr. ARENS. Why?

Mr. WILCOX. Well, if such a person had subversive tendencies, they could monitor such information. I don't know whether he might have access to the code or whatever else he might have—he could pass it on to whom he might wish. There is a potential danger there, as I see it.

Mr. ARENS. Am I clear in my interpretation of your testimony that the defense agencies of this Government do have leased wires going through New York City?

Mr. SHUTE. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. And those leased wires are serviced by employees of the Western Union Co., who are members of the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct.

Mr. ARENS. Which has been ejected from the CIO because of its promoting the purposes of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILCOX. That is correct.

Now, these people have access to traffic moving over some 450 leased circuits and 250 teletype channels terminating at New York City that are also susceptible to monitoring. By teletype channel I might explain that is a method Western Union has developed for, say, splitting what is normally termed a channel into various segments

so that the one channel can be used by a number of different customers.

Mr. ARENS. Would you pause there a minute? I want to ask you another question. Is the company empowered to discharge an employee solely because that employee is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WILCOX. No. In fact, we would be guilty of several things if we tried it, I am afraid.

Mr. ARENS. Am I clear in my impression from your testimony that the company was obliged to bargain with the American Communications Association?

Mr. WILCOX. Yes; they very emphatically were.

Mr. ARENS. Have you, in the course of your employment during the period of time you were in ACA and in the Communist Party, had occasion to see restricted messages?

Mrs. YEWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Could you tell us about them?

Mrs. YEWELL. The last restricted message that I saw was about a movement of rubber. The first word of the message, which was a Government message, was "restricted." To myself, I didn't think that message had any right even on Western Union's wires. It gave the number of the cars, the destination, and the name of the railroad. It was a long tabulated message about this rubber and its movement.

Mr. ARENS. Have you also, Mrs. Yewell, while you were a member of the Communist Party and a member of the American Communications Association in the course of your work with the Western Union, seen messages on production?

Mrs. YEWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ARENS. Were they restricted, too?

Mrs. YEWELL. They did not have the word "restricted."

Mr. ARENS. What did they have on them?

Mrs. YEWELL. Different defense companies saying reasons why they couldn't fill orders. We have all the messages coming through with an assigned number, DO number.

In April 1955 Secretary of the Army Wilber Brucker, who was then Counsel to the Army, appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. Here are excerpts from his testimony:

Mr. ARENS. Are you aware of the fact that the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon at this very hour are serviced by the American Communications Association which has been repeatedly found to be a Communist-controlled organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I see your point and I am very glad that you raised that. Yes, and we are disturbed.

Mr. ARENS. Is there any way, Governor, that the Defense Department could preclude access under existing law, preclude access to the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon to persons in the American Communications Association, a Communist-dominated organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I know of none.

Mr. ARENS. In other words, at the present time, although the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon are serviced by a Communist-controlled organization, the Defense Department is, under existing law, helpless to protect itself?

Mr. BRUCKER. To that extent it certainly is.

Mr. ARENS. Are you cognizant of the fact that there has been testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee to the effect that persons under discipline of the Communists controlling the American Communications Association now have access to messages coming from the Pentagon by a monitor system whereby they can plug in, listen to conversations—

Mr. BRUCKER. Regrettably, yes, I know that.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the facts which have been revealed by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate to the effect that restricted telegrams coming in from the Pentagon have been intercepted by persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. I am aware of that.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with the fact that the North Atlantic cable which carries very important messages vital to the security of our Nation is now serviced by the American Communications Association, a Communist-controlled labor organization?

Mr. BRUCKER. I have learned that, too.

Mr. ARENS. And I take it, if I am not being a little bit redundant here, that under the present law and under the present powers vested in the Defense Department, the Defense Department is absolutely helpless to cut off that access to the messages?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is correct.

Senator BUTLER. As is every other agency of Government that you know of?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is right, every other agency.

Mr. ARENS. Would you propose, Governor, if this bill should become law, that steps would be taken as soon as possible to preclude access to the tie lines and leased lines out at the Pentagon and to the North Atlantic cable of persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. I would certainly anticipate that steps would be taken to get at that precise problem.

Mr. ARENS. Governor, are you at all conversant with the general, not the specific, the general technique of trying to break a code, one nation trying to break the secret code of another nation?

Mr. BRUCKER. Yes; I am.

Mr. ARENS. You know, of course, do you not, Governor, that one of the techniques of trying to break a code is to have access to messages involved in sending that code; is not that correct?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is.

Mr. ARENS. Is it not true that coded messages of the Pentagon, highly confidential coded messages of the Pentagon which go out over the tie lines and leased lines serviced by the Communist-controlled American Communications Association are in such situation or status that they can be available by a monitoring system even though in code to persons under discipline of the Communist-controlled American Communications Association?

Mr. BRUCKER. You have described it correctly.

Mr. ARENS. And do you, as the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, who has access to the security information of the Department of Defense, feel that that condition, that situation, is a large or at least a situation of grave concern to this Government?

Mr. BRUCKER. I feel, sir, that that situation is nothing short of deplorable to be allowed to continue any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Senator BUTLER. And, Governor, in addition to the existing situation so far as monitoring is concerned, those people are always there to sabotage those very important communication lines, aren't they?

Mr. BRUCKER. They are, and while I would not describe or give any information of an unclassified nature, I know a place or places where that could occur with disastrous results.

Senator BUTLER. In other words, you have a double threat that is presently right here at this moment?

Mr. BRUCKER. That is right.

Senator BUTLER. Breaking the code through the frequency of messages obtainable by them or to which they have access, and

also the chance of sabotage of these very important communications in the event of emergency?

Mr. BRUCKER. Yes, sir.

Here is an excerpt of testimony during these same hearings from a representative of the Pentagon:

Mr. STOHL. The ways and means employed by a saboteur to inflict damage are as varied as human imagination. However, when such talents are exercised against vital areas of facilities considered highly essential to our Nation's defense, the loss can be as serious as a major military reverse. The employment of known Communists in this type of facility enhances the possibilities of sabotage. Common sense dictates the removal of such individuals from these plants.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the following:

1. It is not now, nor has it ever been, the purpose of the bill, nor the intention of the Department of Defense to enter into a program of nationwide screening. The intent is to remove a relatively few known dangerous persons from a relatively small number of our most vital facilities.

2. I want to assure this committee that this problem has been considered over a number of years in the executive branch of the Government at the highest levels. Each time, over this period of years, the conclusion has been reached that our security program is not adequate so long as we are aware of the fact that hundreds of known Communists are in our most vital industrial facilities without legal authority to remove them.

3. Unless this legislation is enacted, we are not in a position to assure the Congress and the American people that all reasonable measures are being undertaken to safeguard our national security.

Senator BUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Stohl.

The well-known, able, and respected columnist Victor Riesel discussed the need for this legislation within the last 10 days. Here is what he said:

It would cost us \$100 million to make a Soviet-type moon shot, Pentagon scientists, afflicted with a bad case of budget-itis, tell you in awe. By comparison, a big missile is dirt cheap, just \$35 million, though one twisted wire or one badly-soldered electronic part can burn up before it gets higher than the commanding officer's temper.

Yet, despite the high cost of lifting one of these celestial gadgets, this Government has been forced to permit some 2,000 known Communists and professional saboteurs to work in classified plants which turn out parts and assemble component sections of missiles for the big race.

For well over a year the Pentagon has been seeking the power to get these workers fired—or at least shifted completely out of the secret plants. They told the House Un-American Activities Committee about it in detailed testimony.

That was on October 9, 1957. On that day, five top Pentagon counterintelligence and security officers went up the Hill. They are all respected men. They said there were 2,000 known saboteurs. They warned that they could not guarantee adequate protection against industrial espionage and sabotage. To make this record solid, here are the men who testified: A. Tyler Port, Director, Office of Security Policy; Robert Applegate, Staff Director, Industrial Security Programs Division; Paul Goldsborough, Staff Director, Communications Division; John H. Fanning, then Director of Domestic Programs; and Jack L. Stempler, Assistant General Counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Port said: "Acts of sabotage and espionage are usually committed by an individual or several individuals, rather than by an organization. Consequently, any preventive or

corrective measures taken should be directed against such misguided persons and not necessarily against organizations to which they belong."

The Pentagon simply wanted a law which could move some 2,000 identified potential saboteurs not only from a secret department but from the factory itself. At the moment, the Pentagon can only lift a suspect out of a classified division. It cannot, for example, get a janitor fired even if he is a known member of the Communist Party. That's a fact.

A proposed law was written. It was called the Defense Facilities Protection Act. No one headed the House Un-American Activities Committee. The bill died. Committee member GORDON SCHERRER, Cincinnati, finally reported on the floor of the House the other day the estimate of 2,000 potential spies, but it was lost in the torrent of words from others. * * *

Just one 10-cent phone call would have revealed that the Pentagon has spent millions tracing these workers.

Operating through its industrial security program, the Pentagon has checked upward of 3 million workers on a front ranging from the palm trees of the Florida coast to the ice-bound ships now part of the Arctic distant early warning system.

Of these, 2 million have been cleared for confidential information. Another 750,000 workers were cleared for top secret and secret data. There were 3,459 suspect cases at the time of the last count. Of these, clearances were denied or revoked in 1,006 cases. But it was all wasted. Many were just shifted to other floors and departments. The law doesn't permit us to do any more. Now that's a handy crowd to have around gadgets costing \$35 million each.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the history of modern warfare has established that the defense of any country is greatly dependent upon the effective and continued operation of its industrial economy and the full utilization of its productive capabilities. In time of war or of preparation for defense from attack by a potential aggressor, injury to the industrial economy or impairment of the productive capabilities of a country may severely curtail its military effectiveness, and such injury or impairment has become a major objective of aggressor nations in their preparation for and prosecution of war;

(2) there exists in the United States a limited number of individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage of the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, espionage, or other subversive acts in order to weaken the power and ability of the United States to cope with actual or threatened war, invasion, insurrection, subversive activity, disturbance, or threatened disturbance of international relations;

(3) in such circumstances it is essential that, without impairing the rights or privileges of the great bulk of loyal United States citizens, such individuals be barred from access to facilities injury to which would be harmful to the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, and, therefore, to its military effectiveness.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President finds by proclamation or Executive order that the

security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to bar from access to any defense facility or facilities individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts. The President may perform any function vested in him by this Act through or with the aid of such officers or agencies as he may designate.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no measure instituted, or rule or regulation issued, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall operate to deprive any individual of access to any defense facility or facilities unless such individual shall first have been notified of the charges against him and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against the charges. Such charges shall be sufficiently specific to permit the individual to respond to them, and such opportunity shall, if the individual so desires, include a hearing. The Administrative Procedure Act shall not be applicable to proceedings under this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require any investigatory organization of the United States Government to disclose its informants or other information which in its judgment would endanger its investigatory activity: *Provided, however, That in the event that such information is not disclosed the individual charged shall be furnished with a fair summary of the information in support of the charges against him.*

(c) The measures instituted, or rules or regulations issued, pursuant to subsection (a) hereof may operate to bar summarily any individual from access to any defense facility or facilities provided that such individual shall be notified in writing of the charges against him within fifteen days from the time he is so barred and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against such charges, including, if he so requests, a hearing within thirty days of the date of such request. Reasonable continuances may, however, be permitted if consistent with expeditious disposition of the matter. A determination shall be made and transmitted to the individual affected within thirty days from the date of the termination of the hearing or, if no hearing is requested, of the submission of the individual's defense to the charges, and if administrative proceedings are provided by the rules or regulations for review of any such determination they shall be promptly determined. In the event that the summary bar against such individual is removed as a result of any proceeding, the individual shall be compensated by the United States solely for his loss of earnings in or in connection with any defense facility during the period he was so barred.

(d) As used in this Act the term "defense facility" shall have the same meaning as it has in title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, but shall not include vessels, piers, or waterfront facilities.

SEC. 4. Whoever willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this Act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any individual of any rights or benefits conferred upon him by the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, an unprecedented crisis has arisen in some of the Nation's school districts. In an effort to circumvent the orders of State and Federal courts and in defiance of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, State and local officials have taken it upon themselves to close certain public schools. It is hard to believe that, in the middle of the 20th century, public schools in the greatest democracy on earth are actually being closed and instruction halted. But this tragedy is indeed unfolding before an astonished Nation and a startled world and indications are that the nightmare will spread still further before these unfortunate children are returned to their classrooms. It is now reported that closed schools in one of the areas will reopen. Nevertheless, boys and girls have been without any educational opportunities for months. Other schools are still closed. Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to provide these children with public education until the local authorities see fit to assume their responsibilities and reopen the local schools.

Mr. Speaker, all citizens of this Nation have a right to an education, wherever they live and whomever they might be. The Federal Government has already, and rightly, assumed responsibility for the education of children living on military reservations. But as has already been suggested by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, this is no longer a sufficient expression of the Federal responsibility.

Therefore, I am introducing two bills today designed to get these children back into public schools. The first of these bills amends Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress by providing that the United States Commissioner of Education shall establish and operate free public schools for the education of children whose schools are closed in order to avoid compliance with the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The bill provides for the procedures which the Commissioner is to follow, the type of education to be provided and to whom.

Thousands of schoolchildren in the United States are not going to school. The date of the reopening of their school is uncertain, at best. "The education of our children is of national concern, and if they are not educated properly, it is a national calamity."

A related problem is the hateful, despicable and intolerable series of bombings of public schools which has occurred in recent months. These criminal acts may very well become—if they have not already—a concerted and cynical master plan designed to thwart or intimidate the peaceful compliance with court orders affecting public schools. Localities which endeavor to abide by the law are

the ones most likely to be victimized by these vicious bombings. The Federal Government should demonstrate to them that it stands ready to assist them in the speedy restoration of their school facilities. Accordingly, the second bill which I am introducing today amends Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress by providing that the Federal Government undertake to construct minimum school facilities in an area where the existing facilities have been maliciously destroyed, in whole or in substantial part. The local educational agency will eventually repay the Federal Government for this construction in such manner as the U.S. Commissioner of Education deems appropriate without imposing an undue financial burden on the local educational agency. The bill further provides that the use of such a facility shall never be discontinued in an effort to avoid compliance with a State or Federal court order enforcing the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Our richest national resource is our children, yet there are thousands of them being deprived of their right to a free public education, at a time when we can ill afford to squander any of our talents or resources. We must meet this challenge in a courageous and creative manner.

TO PASS A SOUND LABOR REFORM BILL

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced some revisions to my proposed Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 which provides for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, and for other purposes.

On January 15 I announced my intention to offer such revisions or amendments to the bill which I originally introduced on the opening day of this session, January 7.

The following three provisions are among those included in the revised version of the bill:

First. Provisions are made for holding National Labor Relations Board hearings prior to union representation elections. This will expedite union representation procedure and will offer another safety measure to keep corrupt elements from being able to win collective-bargaining rights for honest but unsuspecting workers.

Second. The National Labor Relations Act requirement for union officers to sign a non-Communist oath is repealed in my proposal because such a requirement is considered to be strictly a negative approach to assuring that only loyal Americans advance to union leadership posts.

Third. Persons convicted of serious crimes are prohibited from service as union officers or employees, unless they were convicted while a minor, or unless they have been approved by a U.S. district court, after proper hearings, to hold offices in or be employed by a labor organization. Court approval could not be given until at least 5 years after the termination of the last conviction.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that my proposed bill is similar to the one introduced in the Senate by Senators KENNEDY and ERVIN, except with reference to the revisions which I have just enumerated above. All other revisions made in my original bill are in line with the Kennedy-Ervin labor-reform proposals.

The first two revisions to my proposed measure—provision for pre-election hearings by the National Labor Relations Board and repeal of the non-Communist oath—are not in the Kennedy-Ervin bill; and whereas the Senate bill would require the Secretary of Labor to approve for union offices or employment such persons as were convicted of serious crimes, my revised bill would allow approval by judicial process, that is, through a Federal court. Such an arrangement would keep the Department of Labor, which has several major functions under this bill, from being overloaded. It is also my considered opinion that more expeditious action would ensue by means of court procedure. In addition to this, my bill would not prohibit from service as a union officer or employee any person convicted of a crime while a minor. This provision is not found in the Senate bill.

The following major points are the same in both bills:

First. Comprehensive and detailed disclosure of union financial data;

Second. Reports by union officers on conflict-of-interest transactions;

Third. Criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries on books, failure to report, or destruction of union books;

Fourth. Suits by union members for recovery of funds embezzled or misappropriated by union officers;

Fifth. Prohibition of loans by employers or unions to union officers;

Sixth. Secret ballot election of all union officers or of the convention delegates who select them;

Seventh. Due notice of all union elections, and real opportunity to nominate opposing candidates;

Eighth. Secret ballot election of union officers every 4 years by international unions and every 3 years by local unions;

Ninth. Prohibition of the use of union funds to support the candidacy of any union officer;

Tenth. Empower the Secretary of Labor to institute court action to set aside improper elections and conduct new elections;

Eleventh. Strict standards for the imposition of trusteeships and a limit of 18 months on their duration;

Twelfth. Mandatory annual reports to the Department of Labor and to union members on every trusteeship with the reasons for its establishment, continuance, and operation;

Thirteenth. Prohibition on counting votes of delegates of trustee bodies unless such delegates are elected by secret ballot, and on transfer of funds from trusted local unions to internationals except normal dues and assessments;

Fourteenth. Empower the Secretary of Labor to begin court proceedings to break improper trusteeships;

Fifteenth. Prohibition of picketing for extortion or to secure a payoff from employer;

Sixteenth. Prohibition of solicitation or payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers;

Seventeenth. Public financial reports of the operating of Nathan Shefferman-type middlemen; and a prohibition of channeling bribes and improper influence through such middlemen; and

Eighteenth. Elimination of the "no-man's-land" problem which denied NLRB action on local labor racketeering by directing the NLRB to exercise its full jurisdiction under the Taft-Hartley Act.

I introduced this legislation as a result of my being deeply disturbed and much concerned with specific accounts of corrupt practices in labor and management activities. The reforms in my proposals are sought by those—both in and out of Congress—who recognize the necessity for Federal legislation in the field of labor-management relations. I realize, however, that there are some individuals and organizations which oppose such anticorruption legislation because what they really want is another legislation.

It has been clearly shown through congressional and other investigations and hearings that corruption in labor-management relations is real, not fancied, and constitutes a malignant growth in the sinews of both labor and management.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this labor reform bill because we can no longer stand idly by and watch the lethal corruption disease gnaw away at the foundations and principles of labor and management, and consequently at the hard core of our economy and our democracy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HERLONG (at the request of Mr. SIKES), for 1 hour, on Monday next.

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. VANIK, for 1 hour, on February 2.

Mr. MAGNUSON, for 20 minutes, on February 2.

Mr. MACK of Washington, for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. McGOVERN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SLACK.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. CRAMER to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

(At the request of Mr. HALLECK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

Mr. KNOX.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. BOW, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RAY.

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. AYRES.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

442. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audits of the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1954 to 1957 (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

443. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide a revolving fund for certain loans by the Secretary of Agriculture for improved budget and accounting procedures, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

444. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program from August 2, 1954, through December 31, 1957, pursuant to the Housing Act of 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

445. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 108); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

446. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of the balance sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1958, pursuant to the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 974); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

447. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

entitled "A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

448. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

449. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize elimination of a hearing in certain cases under section 408"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

450. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; and to increase the monetary amount of fines for violation of the criminal provisions"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

451. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

452. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

453. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 30(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 187(a)), to prevent the undesirable division of oil and gas leaseholds"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

454. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a proposed concession contract with Mr. Floyd L. Thompson, authorizing him to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park, Ark., pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

455. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Dr. Raymond A. Vonderlehr and certain other officers of the Public Health Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

456. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, in order to limit to cases involving the national security the prohibition on payment of annuities and retired pay to officers and employees of the United States, to clarify the application and

operation of such act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

457. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the General Services Administration report on positions compensated under authority of Public Law 623, 84th Congress, during calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 20. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 19; with amendment (Rept. No. 13). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 36. Resolution providing a clerk for the House delegation of the United States Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarians' Conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 81; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 79. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 78; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 92. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 107. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 91; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 108. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 19). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 126. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 101; with amendment (Rept. No. 20). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 131. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 136. Resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies conducted pursuant to House Resolution 56, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 139. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 133; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 137. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2256. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans; to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 3539. A bill to repeal the act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3540. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 3541. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3542. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which

may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 3544. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 3545. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members and labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 3546. A bill providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations; requiring disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and their officers and agents and reports of direct and indirect dealings between them and employers which may conflict with obligations as employee representatives; reinforcing rights of members and labor organizations with respect to funds and property, the election and removal of officers, and the exercise by other labor organizations of supervisory control, of such organizations; providing penalties for certain criminal acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 3547. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 3548. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3549. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 3550. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to

revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3551. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3552. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 3553. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H.R. 3554. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3555. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3556. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3557. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H.R. 3559. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3561. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 3562. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3563. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 3564. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

States under contract, and such taxes are thereafter required to be refunded, and such person has agreed to accept rebate of such taxes in installments over a 5-year period, such person may repay to the United States the amount of such reimbursement in similar installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3601. A bill to provide that where a person has paid State or local property taxes and been reimbursed therefor by the United States under contract, and such taxes are thereafter required to be refunded, and such person has agreed to accept rebate of such taxes in installments over a 5-year period, such person may repay to the United States the amount of such reimbursement in similar installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 3602. A bill to provide that where a person has paid State or local property taxes and been reimbursed therefor by the United States under contract, and such taxes are thereafter required to be refunded, and such person has agreed to accept rebate of such taxes in installments over a 5-year period, such person may repay to the United States the amount of such reimbursement in similar installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 3603. A bill to provide that where a person has paid State or local property taxes and been reimbursed therefor by the United States under contract, and such taxes are thereafter required to be refunded, and such person has agreed to accept rebate of such taxes in installments over a 5-year period, such person may repay to the United States the amount of such reimbursement in similar installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 3604. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to increase the amount available thereunder for housing loans to educational institutions and hospitals, and to authorize loans to educational institutions for classroom buildings and other academic facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3605. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to establish a new program for the housing of elderly persons of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3606. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single person can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a family can qualify for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 3607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income-tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3608. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain land on the island of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3609. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3610. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works; to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3611. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 3612. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 3613. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that interest on moneys advanced by a city in connection with the financing of an urban renewal project may be included as an item of its gross project cost; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3614. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3615. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H.R. 3616. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a reduction in the manufacturers' excise taxes on passenger automobiles and automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3618. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 3619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose import taxes on lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3620. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3621. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3622. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3623. A bill to amend the national defense amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 3624. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3625. A bill to provide a particular designation for the proposed dam and lock on the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3626. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood control, navigation, or

reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3627. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit a 1-year carryover of cotton farm acreage allotments where bad weather prevented planting; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3628. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for lease and transfer of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3629. A bill to provide for emergency furlough or leave for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States in the event of the death of a member of such person's immediate family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3630. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3631. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for small businesses which establish or expand facilities utilizing surplus agricultural commodities in new industrial products or uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3633. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3634. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 3635. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3637. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3638. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to the transportation of house trailers upon permanent change of station of members of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3639. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 3640. A bill relating to the amount of loss recognized for income tax purposes in the case of certain casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 3641. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3642. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3643. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of income tax imposed by certain municipalities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3644. A bill to facilitate the distribution of surplus food products to needy families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 3645. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first \$50 per month of an individual's earned income shall be disregarded by the State agency in determining his need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3646. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to provide that a State in certain cases may furnish aid to dependent children in the form of goods and services rather than money, and may furnish aid to dependent children living in foster homes, without forfeiting its entitlement thereunder to Federal grants for aid to such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3647. A bill to amend section 402(a) (7) of the Social Security Act, so as to reduce the amount of the deductions which may be made on account of outside income from the benefits payable with respect to needy dependent children thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 3648. A bill to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3649. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3650. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 3651. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the manufacturers excise tax on television receiving sets shall not apply to all-channel or ultra-high-frequency sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 3652. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3653. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:
H.R. 3654. A bill—

DECLARATION AND PURPOSE OF POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity to all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3655. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the drilling of the first oil well at Titusville, Pa., in 1859; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3656. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 3657. A bill authorizing the improvement of the channel to Port Mansfield, Tex., in the interest of navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 3658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to improve the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund and to reduce and ultimately eliminate the manufacturers excise taxes on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3659. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to provide that the Civil Rights Commission shall have until January 2, 1961, to submit its report, findings, and recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 3660. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 3661. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCGINLEY:

H.R. 3662. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Nebraska, in the construction of the Mid-State project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3663. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to buy tickets from certain common carriers operating in the District of Columbia and to sell these tickets at reduced prices to schoolchildren; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 3664. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 3665. A bill to provide that the statute of limitations on refunds of overpayments of income taxes shall not apply to overpayments by Indians arising from the erroneous inclusion in gross income of certain income not subject to Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the manufacturers excise tax on television receiving sets shall not apply to all-channel or ultra-high-frequency sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 3667. A bill to amend section 170(b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions to libraries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3668. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3669. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Louisiana among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3670. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3671. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3672. A bill to provide voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for self-employed physicians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3673. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3674. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 3675. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 3676. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the city of Tillamook, Ore.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 3677. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain land on the island of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3678. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3679. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3680. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 3681. A bill to provide for free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abeldard Reynolds School No. 42, Rochester, N.Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3682. A bill to permit the processing of certain applications under the Small Tracts Act for lands included in the Caribou and Targhee National Forests by the act of August 14, 1958; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3683. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3684. A bill to increase farm income and to expand markets for cotton by enabling cotton to be sold competitively in domestic and foreign markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 3685. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3686. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3687. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 3688. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3689. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3690. A bill to incorporate the National Association of State Militia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 3691. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 3692. A bill relating to withholding, for the purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3693. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 3694. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Father Abraham Joseph Ryan, the "Poet-Priest of the Confederacy"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 3695. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 3698. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically de-

pressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 3699. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 3700. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 18 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 3701. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first \$50 per month of earned income may be disregarded by the State agency in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance or disability assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 3702. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3703. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3704. A bill to redefine the authority of the Secretary of Interior and others with respect to the formulation and evaluation of projects for the development of the Nation's water resources, to establish water resources commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the annuities payable thereunder, to reduce the age at which such annuities become payable in certain cases, to remove certain restrictions on an individual's right to such annuities, to increase the yield on investments made from the railroad retirement account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3706. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for VHF booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3707. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3708. A bill to provide authority to make payments for all damages and losses suffered by those displaced by the acquisition of property required for or affected by the construction of navigation, flood control, or related water development projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3709. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and for recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and

Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 3711. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3712. A bill to amend section 545 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension to widows of World War I veterans shall be increased to \$1,800 without dependents, and \$3,600 with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3713. A bill to amend section 131(a) of title 23 of the United States Code to provide that increased payments to a State shall be only for regulation of outdoor advertising and not for its prohibition; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 3715. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3716. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3717. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops eligible for donations of surplus real and personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3719. A bill to extend benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain persons injured while engaged in civil defense activities during World War II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3720. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide lump-sum payment for the unused sick leave to the credit of an officer or employee immediately prior to his separation from the service on retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to limit the terms of office of members of the Board of

Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3722. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 3723. A bill to expedite the utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 3724. A bill to revise the basis for establishing wartime service connection for multiple sclerosis and the chronic functional psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3725. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 3726. A bill to provide for a memorial in the city of Detroit, Mich., to certain American soldiers who died in the War of 1812; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 3727. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States or Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARGIS:

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend section 512 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War who have less than 70 days' service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 3730. A bill to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3731. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 3732. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for VHF booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3733. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.R. 3734. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3735. A bill to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 3736. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 3737. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for very high frequency booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 3738. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building and courthouse at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 3739. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction in areas affected by Federal activities, to require the Commissioner of Education to provide schools for students whose schools are maliciously destroyed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3740. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for very high frequency booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3741. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and non-metallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3742. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to require the Federal Government to operate schools for the education of children whose schools are closed in order to avoid compliance with the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3743. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for very high frequency booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3744. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and for recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3745. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 3746. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3747. A bill to authorize gratuitous benefits for a remarried widow of a veteran upon termination of her remarriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3749. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fix a special compensation rate for service-incurred disability in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3750. A bill to provide further bases for determinations with respect to disability for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3751. A bill to amend sections 322 (6) and (7) and 415 (b), (c), and (d) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of wartime death compensation, and dependency and indemnity compensation, to parents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3752. A bill to amend section 641 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to provide a Federal payment of \$1,000 instead of \$700 per annum to State homes for each veteran of any war cared for therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3753. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to insert an additional subparagraph (7) to exclude commercial life insurance payments, not in excess of \$10,000, in the consideration of annual income for pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3754. A bill to amend sections 522 (a) and 545 (a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the income limitations for disability and death pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3755. A bill to amend section 416 (b) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the granting of death compensation to certain widows and parents notwithstanding a prior election to receive dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3756. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to require the Federal Government to operate schools for the education of children whose schools are closed in order to avoid compliance with the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3757. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction in areas affected by Federal activities, to require the Commissioner of Education to provide schools for students whose schools are maliciously destroyed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 3758. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend loan guaranty benefits to certain veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3759. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans; to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3760. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3761. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual's annuity based in part on military service shall not be reduced by reason of the payment to such individual of veteran's benefits based on the same service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H.R. 3762. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and very high frequency translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 3763. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall save historic buildings and works of art owned by the United States and shall restore such works of art which have deteriorated or become damaged; to provide high standards of architectural design and sound decoration for Federal public buildings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3764. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to require the Federal Government to operate schools for the education of children whose schools are closed in order to avoid compliance with the 14th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3765. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to school construction in areas affected by Federal activities, to require the Commissioner of Education to provide schools for students whose schools are maliciously destroyed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3766. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 3767. A bill to amend paragraph (k) of section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 3768. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3769. A bill to amend section 6(a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the national minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 3770. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall save historic buildings and works of art owned by the United States and shall restore such works of art which have deteriorated or become damaged; to provide high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3771. A bill to promote television reception to small communities and to rural and isolated areas by establishing a Community Television Bureau in the Federal Communications Commission and waiving the requirement for construction permits for very high frequency booster stations in operation on or before December 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 3772. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3773. A bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to minimize the competitive advantage which Government-owned reservoir projects have in the sale of electric power and energy over privately owned facilities, by providing for payments in lieu of taxes to be made by such reservoir projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 3774. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve the acquisition of certain lands of national historical significance or of interest therein, for highway purposes; and to insure that highway plans are developed with due regard to community planning; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 3775. A bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to permit the use of food for peace; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim annually the first week of March as National Dress Right Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully and completely employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Communications Commission authorize and modify rules concerning VHF-TV booster stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully and completely employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, entitled "The Prayer Room in the U.S. Capitol"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully and completely employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American people must more fully and completely employ the plentiful resources of the American farmer to enhance the standard of living throughout the free world and to bolster the political and economic stability of those nations which have embarked upon programs of economic construction; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGINLEY:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution favoring the operation of VHF television booster or repeater stations under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct an investigation and study of the alternatives to conscription; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 145. Resolution authorizing additional copies for use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of committee print entitled "Present Relations of the Federal Government to the American Indian"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 146. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 130; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 147. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations coming within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 148. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 147; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 149. Resolution authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study and investigate the disposition of certain Federal funds; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island memorializing Congress to enact legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its proper responsibility in equalizing the burden of financing the employment security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its proper responsibility in equalizing the burden of financing the employment security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3776. A bill for the relief of the Wiregrass Baseball Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3777. A bill for the relief of Minoru Tanaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3778. A bill for the relief of Maria Giorgia Rotolo Sinatra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3779. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles F. Dillon, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 3780. A bill for the relief of Boris Dralsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 3781. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Loftis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3782. A bill for the relief of the estate of Willard Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 3783. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3784. A bill for the relief of Angelines Cuacos Steinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3785. A bill for the relief of Blanka Krickovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3786. A bill for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Angelidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3788. A bill for the relief of Casmir Wodzisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3789. A bill for the relief of Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3790. A bill for the relief of Rose Mary Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3791. A bill to admit the vessel *Pitts-Merritt* to American registry and to permit its use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. of

New York; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3792. A bill to admit the vessel *John F. Drews* to American registry and to permit its use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. of New York; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3793. A bill for the relief of Valerie Joyce Douglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zabel Tauti Soultanian (also known as Mrs. Zabel Tauti Sultanian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 3795. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Pagano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3796. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Piazza, doing business as the Northeastern Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3798. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3799. A bill for the relief of Soterios Mallios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 3800. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud A. Provoost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3801. A bill for the relief of Harry and Lena Stopnitsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3802. A bill for the relief of Angelos Karydis and Maria Karydis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3803. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gargano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3804. A bill for the relief of Rosolina Ciufferr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H.R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Religiosa Luigia Frizzo, Religiosa Vittoria Garzoni, Religiosa Maria Ramus, Religiosa Ines Ferrario, and Religiosa Roberta Ciccone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 3806. A bill for the relief of Theodore Psychos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 3807. A bill for the relief of Anna Grazzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 3808. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Hugh Herndon, Jr., and, posthumously, to Clyde Pangborn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 3809. A bill for the relief of Gerard De Haan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3810. A bill to provide for the extension of patent No. 2,806,656, issued September 17, 1957, relating to a railroad rail of improved strength and safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 3811. A bill for the relief of Jose Gregoriante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 3812. A bill for the relief of Chun Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3813. A bill for the relief of Gianbatista Grosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 3814. A bill for the relief of Elisa Ona Manlapig Destajo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3815. A bill for the relief of Te-Shao Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 3816. A bill for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3817. A bill for the relief of Jose Santiago Savendra Calza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3818. A bill for the relief of Mar Man Li and his wife, Mar Wong Li Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3819. A bill for the relief of Dominga Recacho, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3820. A bill for the relief of Rocco Giuseppe Lavagnino and his wife Caterina Cirelli Lavagnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 3821. A bill for the relief of Vasili Katsouli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3822. A bill for the relief of Stavroula Katsouli and Lela Katsouli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Spalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Grace C. Ream; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 3825. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3826. A bill for the relief of Lina Maria Pagnutti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3827. A bill for the relief of Jan P. Wilczynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 3828. A bill for the relief of Tarsem Singh Shihota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Konstantina G. Gianibas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3830. A bill for the relief of H. M. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Helen Chan Chu (nee Yin-Lun Chan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Swami Shivananda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H.R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Tom Get; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

53. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Renovo, Pa., railroad pensioners urging the Congress to pass legislation providing for a 10-percent increase in retirement pensions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

54. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Midwest Furniture Co., Hot Springs, S. Dak., relative to requesting that the operation of the booster station in Hot Springs, S. Dak., be continued; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

55. Also, petition of Frank C. Sakran and others, Mechanicsville, Md., sincerely requesting that the House Committee on Un-American Activities not be abolished as a standing committee; to the Committee on Rules.

56. Also, petition of the county clerk of Kauai, Lihue, Kauai, T.H., requesting statehood for Hawaii in 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.